Vol. XI., No. 2. MAY, 1921.

THE MODERN CHURCHMAN

A Magazine to maintain the cause of
TRUTH, FREEDOM, and COMPREHENSIVENESS
in the Church of England.

EDITOR: H. D. A. MAJOR, B.D.

CONTENTS

	PAGE
The Place and Function of the Church To-day J. R. Cohu, M.A.	49
The Incarnation—The *Crux* of the Problem Charles E. Howe.	56
The Evolution of Prayer F. E. Warner, M.A.	61
Neutrality R. H. Charles, D.D., F.B.A.	64
The Emmaus Eucharist W. D. Bainbridge-Bell, M.A.	79
John Elliotson Symes	84
A New French Theological Review P. Gardner, Litt.D., F.B.A.	85
The Reality of Psychic Phenomena C. F. Russell, M.A.	86
Sacraments—Past and Present H. L. Hubbard, M.A.	89
Christianity in Action Maurice Pryke, B.D.	90
The Christ of History John Gamble, B.D.	93

OXFORD: BASIL BLACKWELL, 49 BROAD STREET

Price 1/- net. Annual Subscription, 10/6.

THE MODERN CHURCHMAN

All literary contributions and books for review should be addressed to:—The Rev. H. D. A. MAJOR, B.D., Ripon Hall, Oxford.

All advertisements and orders should be addressed to:—BASIL BLACKWELL, Office of *The Modern Churchman*, 49 Broad Street, Oxford.

THE CHURCHMEN'S UNION

FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF LIBERAL RELIGIOUS THOUGHT

Inaugurated at the Church House, Westminster, October 31st, 1898.

President—Professor PERCY GARDNER, Litt.D., F.S.A., F.B.A., Oxford.

Vice-Presidents:

PHILIP H. BAGENAL, O.B.E.
F. C. CHANNING, Esq.
The ARCHDEACON OF WESTMINSTER, F.B.A.
The Rev. Canon CREMER.
The DEAN OF CARLISLE, F.B.A.
The Rev. HUBERT HANDLEY.
The Rev. GEORGE HENSLOW.
Sir LAURENCE JONES, Bt.
The Rev. Prof. KIRSOPP LAKE.
The Rev. W. MANNING.
The Rev. Dr. MORRISON.
The Rev. Canon PAPILLON.
The DEAN OF PETERBOROUGH.
The Rev. Canon PLUMPTRE.
J. ST. LOE STRACHEY, Esq.
The Rev. Dr. SYMONDS.

Members of the Council:

Chairman: Canon GLAZEBROOK, D.D.

Hon. G. COLERIDGE, Rev. A. FAWKES, M.A., Rev. JOHN GAMBLE, B.D., Rev. W. LUMMIS, B.D., Rev. H. D. A. MAJOR, B.D., C. NORWOOD, D.Litt., Canon PAPILLON, M.A., Mrs. REITH, Mr. H. F. WALKER, Miss E. M. ALLEN, Right Rev. Bishop HAMILTON BAYNES, Mr. W. B. GORDON, Rev. H. HANDLEY, M.A., The Very Rev. W. R. INGE, C.V.O., D.D., Prof. F. B. JEVONS, D.Litt., Rev. C. H. S. MATTHEWS, M.A., Sir HARRY REICHEL, LL.D., Rev. C. F. RUSSELL, M.A., The DEAN OF CARLISLE, Canon TOLLINTON, D.D., Rev. H. A. WILSON, M.A., Rev. C. SHARP, M.A., Rev. Dr. MORRISON, Miss A. GARDNER, Rev. J. R. COHU, M.A., Rev. W. CUNNINGHAM CRAIG, M.A., Rev. C. W. EMMET, B.D., The MASTER OF JESUS COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE, Rev. W. M. PRYKE, B.D., Rev. F. G. GIVEN-WILSON. Hon. Mrs. MATHESON, Rev. A. J. CARLYLE, D.Litt., Rev. C. BASS, M.A., Canon G. RENDALL, D.Litt., Prebendary CALDECOTT, D.Litt., Rev. J. R. COHU, Mrs. MICHELMORE.

Hon. Auditor—Mr. ROBERT WARNER, F.C.A., 221 Moorgate Station Chambers, E.C.2.
Hon. Organizing Secretary—Miss D. NUSSEY, Westfield, Ilkley.
Assistant Hon. Secretary—Miss DOWELL.
Hon. Librarian—Rev. W. M. PRYKE, Bradninch Vicarage, Collumpton, Devon.
Bankers—LONDON CITY AND MIDLAND BANK, 129 New Bond Street, W.1.
Hon. Secretary and Treasurer—P. BAGENAL, O.B.E., 10 Clifford Street, Bond Street, W.1.

AIMS OF THE CHURCHMEN'S UNION.

1.—To affirm the continuous and progressive character of the revelation given by the Holy Spirit in the spheres of knowledge and of conduct.
2.—To maintain the right and duty of the Church of England to restate her doctrines from time to time in accordance with this revelation.
3.—To uphold the historic comprehensiveness of the Church of England.
4.—To defend the freedom of responsible students, clerical as well as lay, in their work of criticism and research.
5.—To promote the adaptation of the Church services to the needs and knowledge of the time.
6.—To assert the claim of the laity to a larger share in the government and responsible work of the Church.
7.—To foster co-operation and fellowship between the Church of England and other Christian Churches.
8.—To study the application of Christian principles and ideals to the whole of our social life.

Annual Subscription.—Members at least 7/6; Associates, 1/-; Life Membership, £10. Cheques should be made payable to the Hon. Secretary of the Churchmen's Union.

All communications as to membership, subscriptions, changes of address, and business matters should be sent to the Hon. Secretary, Churchmen's Union, 10 Clifford Street, Bond Street, W.1.

The Modern Churchman is sent free to all full members of the Churchmen's Union.

CONFERENCE

OF

MODERN CHURCHMEN,

CAMBRIDGE,

August 8—15, 1921.

Conference Committee.

Miss E. M. Allen
Miss C. Barber
P. H. Bagenal, O.B.E.
C. W. Emmet, B.D.
Canon Glazebrook, D.D.
H. D. A. Major, B.D.
Miss D. Nussey
Mrs Reith
C. F. Russell, M.A.

The Conference this year will be held at Cambridge, where by the kindness of the authorities Girton has been placed at the disposal of the committee. The Programme and full list of speakers may be seen in the April number of the *Modern Churchman.*

The Conference will begin on Monday *afternoon*, August 8th, and will end on Monday *morning*, August 15th. The programme proper will end on Saturday *morning*, but it is thought that the extra days will be appreciated by those able to afford the time.

Tickets (including board and lodging) will be £3 15s. 0d. for the week; £2 15s. 0d. for the first five days. *If not paid before July 25th an extra charge of 5/- will be made.* Tickets for the meetings only will be 15/-, for those engaged in teaching 7/6. Admission to single meetings 2/-.

Meals will be provided for a limited number of non-resident members at a reasonable charge.

Tennis. A small charge will be made for the use of the courts and balls.

The Conference will be open to members of the Churchmen's Union, and also, as far as space will allow, to those who are in sympathy with its principles and objects.

Hon. Secretary—Dora Nussey, Westfield, Ilkley.

Hon. Press Secretary—P. H. Bagenal, 11 Spencer Hill, Wimbleton, S.W. 19.

All applications for Tickets, accompanied by full remittance and a stamped and addressed envelope, should be sent to Miss D. Nussey.

HEMBLEY & SONS, PRINTERS, ILKLEY

THE

Modern Churchman

A MONTHLY MAGAZINE
to maintain the cause of truth,
freedom and comprehensiveness
in the Church of England

INDEX—VOL. X

APRIL, 1920—MARCH, 1921

'By identifying the new learning with heresy, you make orthodoxy synonymous with ignorance.'—*Erasmus.*

'A State without the means of some change is without the means of its conservation.'—*Edmund Burke.*

Editor: H. D. A. MAJOR, B.D.
Publisher: BASIL BLACKWELL, Oxford

INDEX I.—CONTRIBUTORS.

PAGE

Ashley, Ph.D., Sir William 325, 386, 540, 561
Bacon, LL.D., D.D., Prof. B. W. ... 286
Bagenal, O.B.E., P. H. 490, 616
Baker, D.D., Rev. Prof. J. Bethune 224, 566, 637
Bax, M.A., Rev. Arthur N. 205
Bindley, D.D., Rev. Canon 566
Bishop of Uganda, The Right Rev. ... 162
Boden, M.A., J. Worsley 66
Bryde, Margaretta B. 80
Caldecott, Litt.D., Prof. Alfred ... 367
Charles, D.D., D.Litt., F.B.A., Ven. R. H. 567
Charnwood, Lord 181, 562
Clutton-Brock, A. 563
Cohu, M.A., Rev. J. R. 127
Coulton, M.A., G. G. 272, 563
Craig, M.A., Rev. W. A. Cunningham ... 217
Creed, M.A., Rev. J. M. 122, 346
Dougall, Miss Lily 57, 640
Emmett, B.D., Rev. C. W. 372, 567, 620
Fawkes, M.A., Rev. Alfred 12, 313, 569
Fletcher, W. Wolfe 185
Gamble, B.D., Rev. John 432, 599
Gardner, Litt.D., LL.D., F.B.A., Prof. Percy 95, 249, 559
Given-Wilson, M.A., Rev. F. G. ... 391
Glazebrook, D.D., Rev. Canon M. G. 305, 461
Gray, M.A., Arthur 564

PAGE

Griffiths, Rev. J. A. S. 531
Handley, M.A., Rev. Hubert 572
Hardwick, M.A., Rev. J. C. 262, 536, 587
Hugel, Baron F. von 101
Hutchinson, M.A., Rev. F. E. 568
Inge, D.D., C.V.O., Very Rev. W. R. 569
Jevons, D.Litt., Prof. F. B. 296
Lee, M.A., Miss Hetty 133
Lowry, M.A., Rev. F. C. 172
Major, B.D., Rev. H. D. A. 28, 245, 400, 455, 478, 515, 558
Matthews, M.A. Rev. C. H. S. 570
Milner, M.A., Rev. G. 487
Mullins, Claud 211
Norwood, Litt.D., Cyril 565
Pryke, B.D., Rev. Maurice 19, 339, 468
Rashdall, D.Litt., F.B.A., Very Rev. Hastings 518, 570
Reichel, LL.D., Sir Harry R. 565
Rendall, D.Litt., LL.D., B.D., Rev. Gerald 35
Royds, B.D., Rev. T. F. 197
Russell, M.A., Rev. C. F. ... 354, 571
Sanday, D.D., F.B.A., Rev. Canon ... 378
Shebbeare, M.A., Rev. C. J. 579
Smith, E. Sharwood 611
Symonds, D.D., LL.D., Rev. H. 420
Walker, H. F. 427
Wickey, N. J. Gould 525

INDEX II.—CORRESPONDENCE.

(A) *CONTRIBUTORS.*

PAGE

'A.T.W.D.' 594
'B.' 240
Boden, M.A., Rev. J. Worsley ... 144, 645
Capleton, Edward 595
Carr, M.D., Thomas 450
Coulthard, M.A., Rev. H. R. 597
'C.W.M.' 241
Dallas, Miss H. A. 47
Dougall, Miss Lily 100
Gardner, J. Lawrence 143
Given-Wilson, M.A., Rev. F. G. ... 550
Glazebrook, D.D., Rev. Canon ... 448, 596
Headlam, D.D., Rev. Canon A. C. ... 46
Kendall, Guy 644
Laurence, Henry 147
Legge, M.A., Rev. Hugh 43
Matthews, M.A., Rev. C. H. S. 146
Morrison, LL.D., Rev. W. D. 549
Mullins, Claud 449
Papillon, M.A., Rev. Canon T. L. ... 243
Pearson, Arthur A. 643
Perrott, M.A., Rev. A. Donaldson ... 148
Pryke, B.D., Rev. Maurice 147
Royds, B.D., Rev. T. F. 646
Russell, M.A., Rev. C. F. 453
Russell, M.A., Rev. C. F., and Boden, M.A., Rev. J. Worsley 598
South African Incumbent 549
Whitworth, W. 451

(B) *SUBJECTS.*

PAGE

Assembly Act, The Church 146
Bergson's View of God 549, 596
Child and Higher Criticism, The 147
Creed of the Re-united Church, The 643, 644, 645
Dangerous Episcopal Teaching 148
Divorce Question, The 240
Divorce and Re-marriage 241
Episcopal Lawlessness 451
Erastianism and Modernism 143
Gentlemen in Holy Orders ... 597, 646
Junior Members of the Churchmen's Union 453, 598
Oxford Honour School of Theology, The 46
Parochial Councils 448
Philosophy and Faith 595
Primate and Divorce, The 147
Reflections of Two Laymen on the Modern Churchmen's Conference ... 449, 459
Religion of the Labouring Classes, The ... 45
Right of Modern Churchmen to Exist ... 550
Science and Spiritualism 47
South African Church, The 549
Spiritualism and Science 100
Wanted: A Prophet 594

INDEX III.—SUBJECTS.

PAGE

African Child Races and their Future, The 162
Amendment of the Church Assembly Act, The 155
Anglo-Catholic Position, The Weakness of the 122
Biblical Infallibility, Danger of 339
Bishops and Biblical Studies 503
Changeless Faith and Changing Thought 461
Chelmsford's Policy, The Bishop of ... 416
Child and Higher Criticism, The 19
Choice of Hymns, The 172
Christ of History, The 599
Christian Adventure, The Spirit of ... 468
Christian Divorce and Re-marriage ... 127
Christian Ethics, The Evolution of ... 305
Christian Freedom, A Powerful Plea for 3
Christian Freedom and the Lambeth Conference 5
Christian Science in Theory and Fact ... 531
Christian Unity and American Idealism 6
Christianity and the Supernatural ... 101
Church Assembly, The 616
Churchmen's Union and the Mansfield Conference, The 49
Churchmen's Union, The Origin of the 490
Churchmen's Union News 43, 243, 454
Clough, Arthur Hugh 80
Clutton-Brock, The Theology of Mr. ... 57
Conference of Modern Churchmen, The Seventh 245
Creed of the Re-united Church, The 506, 558
Danger of Biblical Infallibility 339
Divorce Reform 11
Doctrinal Basis of a Re-united Church, The 420
Doubt of Robertson of Brighton, The ... 525
Edwin Hatch, 1837—1889 378
Episcopal Lawlessness 217
Erastianism Examined 66
Evangelical Attacks on Modernism ... 508
Evangelical Churchmen in Council ... 157
Evolution of Christian Ethics 305
Ex Oriente Lux 152
Experiment in Religious Education, An 611
Facing the Future 455
Facts or Values 224
Four and Twenty Protestants 9
Four Proposed Reforms 417
Free Pulpit, A Really 52
Future State, The 620
Galileo 386
Girton Conference and Dr. Lake's Theories, The 552
Grace, What is? 432
Hatch, Edwin 378

PAGE

Higher Criticism, The Child and 19
History and Christianity 272
History of Religion, Mr. H. G. Wells and the 484
Hymns, The Choice of 172
In Memoriam :—
Mrs. Humphry Ward 12
Lord Russell of Liverpool 35
William Sanday, D.D., LL.D., Litt.D. F.B.A. 407
Inspiration and Infallibility 313
Japanese Estimate of Religion, A ... 551
Joseph Mazzini 391
Lambeth Conference, The 149
Lambeth Proposals, Re-union and the ... 518
Lawlessness, Episcopal 217
Liberal Catholicism and the Creeds ... 504
Liberal Churchmanship, Losses to ... 1
Life, The Triumph of 28
Lull, Raymond 400
Magna Carta of the Laity, The 515
Martineau, The Simplicity of Newman, Spurgeon, and 572
Mazzini, Joseph 391
Meaning of Paul for To-day 640
Miracle, Natural Law and 536
Miracle and Scripture 286
Miraculous, The Passing of the 509
Modern Churchman, The Position of the 478
Modern Conceptions of Morality 295
Modern Conceptions of the Universe and Traditional Christianity 262
Modern Political Ideas 325
Modernism in the Church of England ... 197
Mohammedan Higher Critic, A 153
Morality, Modern Conceptions of 295
Mysticism and Rational Theology 579, 630
Natural Law and Miracle 536, 587
Need for Vigilance, The 427
Newman, Spurgeon, and Martineau, The Simplicity of 572
Old Testament for Teachers, The ... 1
Old Testament, The Problem of the ... 637
Origin of the Churchmen's Union, The 490
Passing of the Miraculous, The 509
Paul for To-day, The Meaning of ... 640
Political Ideas, Modern 325
Population, The Problem of 211
Position of the Modern Churchman, The 478
Poverty of the Clergy, The 511
Presidential Address 249
Press, The Voices of the 159
Primate and Divorce, The 50

PAGE

Private Judgment, The Right of 354
Problem of the Old Testament, The ... 637
Problem of Population, The 211
Psychology, The Recent Extension of ... 367
Psychological and Traditional Christianity 372
Public School Religion 185
Quality of Ordinands 512
Raymond Lull 400
Recent Extension of Psychology, The ... 367
Reflections on Re-union 181
Religious Education, An Experiment in ... 611
Religion in the Schools 9
Religious Teaching in Our Church Schools 205
Religious Question in the Day Schools ... 133
Re-union, Reflections on 181
Re-union and the Lambeth Proposals ... 518
Re-united Church, The Creed of the ... 558
Re-united Church, The Doctrinal Basis of a 420

REVIEWS OF BOOKS :—

Thrust and Counter-Thrust (W. M. Pryke) 38
An Essay in Christian Apologetic (W. M. Pryke) 41
The Christian Adventure (W. M. Pryke) 138
A Weighty Contribution to Re-union (H. D. A. Major) 140
Spiritualism (C. W. Emmett) 231
Salve Mater (Alfred Fawkes) 233
A Companion to the Bible 239
Canon Peter Green's Theodicy (Very Rev. Hastings Rashdall) 437
The Bible and Modern Thought (Alfred Fawkes) 441
Domine Dirige Nos (J. Worsley Boden) 444
The Bible and the Adolescent (W. M. Pryke) 445
A New Version of the Parables (H. D. A. Major) 447
Two New Magazines (H. D. A. Major) 448
Primitive Christianity (J. M. Grant) ... 495
A Revised Prayer-Book (C. W. Emmett) 499
A Tonic for Failing Hearts (J. Worsley Boden) 501
A New Philosophy (J. C. Hardwick) ... 547
Historical Christianity (C. H. S. Matthews) 590

PAGE

An Idealist in Education (J. C. Hardwick) 59
Modern Sermons (H. L. Hubbard) ... 59
Right of Private Judgment, The 35
Robertson of Brighton, The Doubt of ... 52
Roman Catholic Propaganda 5
Russell of Liverpool, Lord 3
Sabbatarians, Old and New 55
Sanday, D.D., LL.D., Litt.D., F.B.A., William 40

SERMONS AND ADDRESSES :—

'The Spirit of Wisdom' 9
'Christianity and the Supernatural' ... 10
'The African Child Races and their Future' 16
'Modernism in the Church of England' 19
'Facts or Values' 22
'In Troublous Times' 54
'The Christ of History' 59
'The Future State' 62
Seventh Conference of Modern Churchmen 24
Signs of the Times 1, 49, 149, 414, 503, 55
Simplicity of Newman, Spurgeon, and Martineau, The 57
Social Service on Modern Lines 55
Spirit of the Anglo-Catholic Congress, The 1
Spirit of Christian Adventure, The ... 4
Spirit of the Lambeth Conference, The ... 43
Spirit of Wisdom, The 9
Spurgeon and Martineau, The Simplicity of Newman, ... 57
Theology of Mr. Clutton-Brock, The ... 3
Triumph of Life, The 3
Troublous Times, In 54
Unitarian Endeavours ... ...
Universe and Traditional Christianity, Modern Conceptions of the 2
Vigilance, The Need for 4
Viscount Bryce and the World Situation
Voices of the Press, The 1
Ward, Mrs. Humphry ... ...
Weakness of the Anglo-Catholic Position, The 1
Wells and the History of Religion, Mr. H. G. 4
What is Grace? 4

THE 'MODERN CHURCHMAN' OFFICE, 49 BROAD STREET, OXFORD.

THE

MODERN CHURCHMAN

By identifying the new learning with heresy, you make orthodoxy synonymous with ignorance.—*Erasmus.*

A State without the means of change is without the means of its conservation.—*Edmund Burke.*

No. 2. MAY, 1921. Vol. XI.

THE PLACE AND FUNCTION OF THE CHURCH TO-DAY

By the Rev. J. R. Cohu, Rector of Aston Clinton, sometime Fellow of Jesus College, Oxford.

'CHURCH,' what do we mean by it? In a clever skit the Rev. J. M. C. Crum exactly hits the popular conception of 'Church':

'On one day in seven at 11 o'clock you unlock a church door, and you all go in and sit down in rows in pews and "remember that you are in church" till 12 o'clock. Sometimes you lean forward and rest your head on your hands, and sometimes you sit back and rest your shoulders against the pews, and sometimes you stand up and glance sideways, but what really matters is to be in rows in the pews and remember that you are in church from 11 o'clock till 12 one day in seven.

'During that solemn hour several people are paid to wait upon the religious people in the pews. Some strong men are paid to pull bells to remind people when the one day in seven has come round again. And some melodious men and boys sing to them when they stand up in their places, and one man is paid to read to them out of very large books when they sit down. And then for about twenty minutes this man reads something he has written himself or talks out of his own head, and this is known of all as the most solemn part of their religion. When it is all over, the people go out and refresh themselves and tell each other what they were thinking about while the man talked. But when they meet the man afterwards, they say to him: "Oh, I did like what you said about pride or gossip; I trust it has done good to some people you and I know of." And all the people say of the one day in seven: "What I like about it is that it is so very English."

'And because it is so very English, and therefore very good, w sail across the seas to places where people live who do not kno these things, and we build a big hut, put seats into it, teach th people to come and sit and stand there one day in seven, and pa strong men to ring bells, and melodious men and boys to sing to th people when they stand up, and one man reads to them out of bi books when they sit down, and talks to them for twenty minutes ou of his own head, and he writes home to say that the eyes of th heathen are being opened, and the people in England send out mone for more huts.'[1]

Now from jest to earnest. It is so easy to caricature ou 'one day in seven,' so easy to make the 'sacrifice of the Mass everything and sneer at Matins and Evensong with their pray ing, Bible-reading, and preaching; yet, for us Englishmen they are our sheet-anchor. Dr. Inge writes: 'The prophet not the priest, was held in honour by the Apostolic Church, and so it has ever been with us as a nation; we are built tha way. And a well-spent 'one day in seven' may produce a lif of service quite as acceptable in God's sight as many dail services. Let us thank God that in every hamlet is a Hous of God with its *altar*, where 'we draw nigh and take the Bod of the Lord'; its *lectern*, where God speaks to us in His Word its *place of prayer*, where we speak to God with heart an voice; its *font*, where Christ takes our little ones in His arm and blesses them; its *pulpit*, where is told us the old old stor of Jesus and His love; let us thank Him, too, for His one da in seven. To our long and loving use of these means of grac we owe all that is best in ourselves and in our England. But good work as our Church is still doing, is she doing all tha Christ means His Church to do?

What is the Church of Christ here for? His Church, take it, is a society, a fellowship, a brotherhood of men full o the Spirit of Christ and carrying on His work. What is th Spirit of Christ, and what is His work? To put it roughly an briefly, Christ stands for the Fatherhood of God, the Brother hood of man, and goodness through the Spirit; and Christ' one aim is the establishment of God's Kingdom of peace an

[1] *St. Martin's-in-the-Fields Review*, March, 1921. The story goes o and in the last part we get the 'good Churchman's' panacea for th Puritanical gloom: 'Substitute Sunday amusements, daily services, an a sung Eucharist for Matins,' and all is now 'sweetness and light'!

oodwill here on earth. Christ is for ever telling us: First lasp your Father's hand and you will soon clasp your brother ian's: 'Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart; his is the first and great commandment. And the second is ke unto it: Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself. On hese two commandments hang all the law and the prophets.' This do, says Christ, and, as a natural sequel, we shall see all nen living together as one big, united family of brothers and isters, in love serving one another, each sinking self for the ood of all, and the Kingdom of God will be here.

This was Christ's one goal, the Kingdom of God:

> 'His gospel was the gospel of the Kingdom; His righteousness was the righteousness of the Kingdom; His disciples were the sons of the Kingdom; His prayer, Thy Kingdom come on earth as it is in Heaven.'[2]

For the work of the Kingdom He trained His followers; 'Preach the Kingdom' was His commission; and, full of His Spirit, devoted to His Person, sharing His faith in the Kingdom, this little band made the work of the Kingdom their life-work, filling men's hearts with love of God and love of one nother.

Clearly, then, Christ's Church is here expressly to voice, oster, deepen the spirit of the Fatherhood of God and Brotherood of Man[3] not only on Sundays in church, but as the mainpring of all we are and all we do in the home, in society, in usiness, in politics. Christ claims the whole of life, in every phere, as His province, even as He Himself would tell you nat as a carpenter He was doing God's work just as much as n His preaching; that He was every whit as much about His 'ather's business as guest at a wedding feast as when He was eeping with those that weep; as near to God in the company f publicans as when He knelt in prayer. This is the Spirit f Christ, and His Church must have in her the mind which as in Christ Jesus. She is here to preach and practise the ame gospel of the Fatherhood of God and Brotherhood of Man, to make brother clasp the hand of brother in work or lay, in joy or sorrow, in poverty or wealth, in all that concerns

[2] *Modern Churchman*, September, 1917, p. 249.

[3] Lambeth Encyclical Letter, see Report, p. 10.

man in body, mind, or soul, without respect of persons. To-day as never before, men are crying out to the Churches for this practical gospel in which love of God and love of man go hand in hand, with its call to comradeship, service, self-sacrifice, each doing to others as he would others should do unto him. As Dr. Diggle, late Bishop of Carlisle, was for ever telling us:

> 'Let us have done with things that do not matter, and do let us put first things first. The primary facts are: The Fatherhood of God, Redemption through Christ by walking in His steps, goodness through the Holy Spirit, and the universal brotherhood of man. Let us make these the alpha and omega of our creed, and all other things—social well-being, political and civil integrity, harmony between capital and labour, domestic felicity, international righteousness, concord between the churches, and the cessation of wars among nations, will be added unto us.'

Thus the one test of a standing or falling Church comes to this: 'Is she effectively doing God's work of the Kingdom?' If she is, neither God nor man cares what machinery she uses for that purpose, bishops or no bishops, six sacraments or two. The Apostolic Church was congregational, the Cyprianic Church episcopal, the Papal Church imperial, the Reformed Church cared little whether there were bishops or not; yet in their day each and all of these were strong and living Churches doing Christ's work of the Kingdom, and doing it well. Why? Because they were earnest, enthusiastic, alive, in touch with reality; they voiced the real life, the real needs, the real aspirations of their day, and in the words and ideas of their day.

Now the gospel of the Kingdom has lost none of its power and men are thirsting for it. Say what parsons will, never were men more religious at heart than to-day; yet our churches are half empty, and the Church is no longer a power in the land. Why? For several reasons; here are just a few.

(1) The Church is dry-rotting with ecclesiasticism,[4] that deadliest enemy of the religion of Christ now as in His own

[4] *Ecclesiasticism* takes sacraments, church-services, holy days, creeds, rites, orders—institutions good in themselves as 'means of grace' bearing fruit in a right life—and, giving them an intrinsic magical virtue of their own, idolises them for their own sake as ends in themselves. Hence the withering terms in which Amos, Hosea, Isaiah, Christ (to whom religion is character and a life of service) tell the priests and people of their day that all this parade of worship (*e.g.* Is. I, 10-19, 'Your sacrifices, sal

day. As the Kikuyu dispute, the present Re-union *impasse*, and the eternal squabbles of High and Low over sacraments amply prove, our real trouble is that we have lost all sense of Gospel values, and ecclesiastical values monopolize the field. What are the things the Church really cares for? Is it the righting of social wrongs and the battling to the death with sin, error and injustice? No; if you want to rouse a Laodicean Church out of her lethargy and see her really 'up and doing,' touch her privileges, her endowments, her tithe, her traditions of men, her orders, her ecclesiastical autocracy. Which is the more distressing to her to-day, 'the fact that four families are living in a five-roomed house, or the fact (so horrible to Father A.) that Mr. B. has no candles on his "Holy Table," or the other fact (so terrible to Mr. B.) that Father A. has incense in his church and wears "Popish" vestments?' It is the silliness and unreality of all this that strikes the layman so forcibly and sickens him. The 'real Christian thing' is lacking, and the values are all wrong. The Church comes first, the Kingdom next to nowhere. 'Mint, anise and cummin' are all in all, while 'judgment, mercy, and faith' are left out in the cold. Speak to-day on the lines of the Sermon on the Mount, and a 'good Churchman' curls the lip at such 'milk and watery Morality Preaching!'

(2) Since the days of the Councils, or even of the Reformation, modern science, philosophy, scholarship, comparative religion, psychology, have given us a new and far deeper and truer knowledge of Nature, of the Bible, of God and man, and have effected a stupendous revolution in our ideas and outlook. Yet here we are as a Church still clinging to ideas and creeds and dogmas of the fourth and sixteenth centuries, which we have quite outgrown. Dare to call into question these obsolete Church-shibboleths, and you will be labelled a perjured man and a traitor. Just imagine a judge or doctor tied down in his practice to-day to what was thought and done in his profes-

baths, holy days, many prayers, solemn assemblies, feasts, my soul hateth') is nothing worth to a God who demands a right life, not sacrifices, and true service, not services (*cf.* Mic. VI, 6-8; Mat. VII, 20 *sqq.*). Directly or indirectly, all the five causes of church-stagnation noted in the text have their root in an ecclesiasticism which regards the Church as an end in herself instead of being only a means towards an end.

sion in the first, fourth, or sixteenth century, forbidden to make even the slightest alteration to meet new light or new need on pain of instant expulsion from his profession! As Froude pointed out long ago:

> 'To say that the clergy, who are set apart to study a particular subject, are to be the only persons unpermitted to have an independent opinion upon it, is like saying that lawyers must take no part in the amendment of the statute-book; that engineers must be silent upon mechanism; and if an improvement is wanted in the art of medicine, physicians may have nothing to do with it.'

Adaptability to new environment is the law of life, and any institution that tries to remain stationary in a moving world is doomed. And are we to believe that the Holy Spirit has abdicated since the first, fourth, or sixteenth century, and is no longer here to guide into all truth?

This farce will go on so long as bishops insist on ordinands undergoing a uniform, stereotyped system of training in Theological Colleges whose intensely ecclesiastical atmosphere is uncongenial to thought, to freedom, to inquiry. There they are taught to magnify their office and that the difference between a priest and layman is a difference, not of degree, but of kind; there they learn to value as their highest treasure traditional views and practices, dogmas and rites, which have no kind of contact with the life of to-day, only with the outlook and controversies of a dead past; there they are supplied with a code of shibboleths by which to test the orthodoxy of others or of any man who desires, under their influence, to enter the Christian fellowship. These quaint old survivals are interesting to the antiquary, but hardly adapted to the work of the Kingdom.

(3) 'The common people heard Christ gladly' (Mk. xii, 37), and working-men apparently formed nine-tenths of the Apostolic Church (*cf.* I Cor. i, 26). To-day they seldom enter our half-empty churches. Why? Working-men have left the Church because the Church first left them. For generations we, as a Church, have seen them sweated, badly housed, badly paid, badly fed. Did the Church stand up for the working-man and see his wrongs righted? Not she! She was too apathetic, too self-centred, too wedded to vested interests, or too afraid to speak, allowing herself to be exploited by the squire and the propertied classes. Now she is suddenly dis-

covering that Labour is likely to be the dominant partner, so here we are all outbidding each other to curry favour with it, as if the working-man was not cute enough to see through it all.

(4 and 5) In the Apostolic Church converts flocked to the Church for two main reasons: (*a*) They saw that Church people were bigger men than non-Christians; 'men took knowledge of them that they had been with Jesus.' Their simple, kindly, honest lives showed it; they were bigger men than their neighbours, more earnest, more charitable, more unselfish, more zealous for righteousness and the service of man. Can men say that of us Churchmen to-day? Is that the note of 'good Churchmanship'?

(*b*) Another trait of early Christians which appealed greatly to outsiders was their intense brotherly love for one another: 'See how these Christians love one another!' Do men say that of the Christian Churches to-day? Yes, with a sneer! In church we bemoan our 'unhappy divisions' as 'crippling the Body of Christ, hindering the activity of His Spirit,' and doing untold harm to His work at home and in the mission field; yet here we are, as a Church, still Pharisaical, intractable, tart in our dealings with other Christian bodies which 'follow not after us.' We cannot blink the plain fact that their work, their ministry, their sacraments are blessed of God every whit as much as ours, yet we flatly refuse to give them the right hand of fellowship unless they submit to our terms and come into line with our episcopal machinery. James, Peter, Paul, Apollos, no more saw eye to eye than do to-day High, Low, Broad, Free; yet, when each saw the blessing of God resting on the other's work, he also saw that God needed them all equally, and each heartily gave the other the right hand of fellowship in 'unity of spirit,' that deep kinship between Spirit-possessed souls which transcends and makes light of all external barriers. 'Good Churchmanship' to-day pooh-poohs such a bond of re-union. *Nous avons changé tout cela!*

* * * * *

It may be urged: 'Ah! but the Lambeth Conference resolutions, with their inspiring call to us all to clasp hands as fellow-workers with God in His work of the Kingdom, are going

to "create a new heart and renew a right spirit within us," and set all these faults of ours right!' I hope they may, but I am not over sanguine. Over and over again have imposing Church Assemblies passed high-sounding and admirable resolutions: we all applaud them to the echo, and go on just as before. 'My people love to have it so' is true of the Church of England to-day, and the shame of our futility rests on us all alike.

Is the Church ready to hate the blemishes that mar her spiritual growth and efficacy? Is she ready, in the spirit of Christ, to give herself heart and soul to the real work of the Kingdom, to face the real life, the real needs, the real aspirations of real men and women? If she is, she will once more 'turn the world upside down,' once more be the leader and inspirer of men, once more will she draw to herself 'all men of good will, all men and women who care for high and noble causes, all who are looking and longing and working for the coming of the Kingdom of God on earth.'[5]

THE INCARNATION

The *Crux* of the Problem.

MANY years ago, after reading Dr. Sanday's *Christologies Ancient and Modern*, I was struck with what seemed to me the unthinkableness and therefore the incredibility of the traditional formula of the doctrine of the Incarnation, that our Lord was 'Perfect God and Perfect Man.'

I discussed the difficulty with my friends, and I ventured to write to some of our leading theologians and philosophers in my endeavour to find out whether is was really as insuperable as it seemed to me. The answers I received were always kind

[5] This article does *not* say: 'Our Church is a failure.' Far from it! She produces fine lives and meets many spiritual needs; her vitality and zeal are great; at heart the nation loves her. But just because her many virtues and charms so uniquely fit her to be Christ's organ for the work of the Kingdom, all the more deplorable is the ecclesiasticism which switches off her energy into wrong channels and saps her influence. Hence the contrast between her individual piety and her corporate stagnation.

and sympathetic, and many of them very exhaustive from the generally accepted point of view, but they none of them satisfied me or even seemed to get at the *crux* of the difficulty at all. Only one of the many correspondents I consulted appeared to have felt a similar difficulty, and he replied:

> 'I fully appreciate the difficulty you raise in regard to the Churchly doctrine of the Incarnation: in fact I regard it as insuperable and I do not hold the doctrine at all in the traditional sense.'

This was from a layman who is one of the foremost philosophical thinkers of our time. After receiving this confirmation of my doubts, I gave up all attempts to reconcile my views with traditional theology, and it is only recently that I have found what appears to me a tenable position with regard to the Christian Faith.

For the purpose of discussing the question I tried to formulate my difficulty in the following statement:—

Man is the creature of God and, even though sinless and perfect, must, as compared with God (unless God and Man are absolutely identical in every respect), be thought of as being subject to certain conditions and limitations which God transcends.

The doctrine of the Incarnation, that our Lord was 'Perfect God and Perfect Man' must mean either:

1. That while on earth He was strictly subject to the conditions and limitations proper to man, in which case His life could not constitute any revelation of His Godhood as distinct from the manifestation of ideal manhood; or:

2. That He transcended those conditions and limitations, in which case it is incredible, as involving a contradiction in terms, that He could also be strictly subject to them, and therefore be truly man.

It is, I believe, an accepted principle, that Catholic doctrine, though it may be above reason, is never contrary to reason; and it is here, I submit, that the *crux* of the problem lies.

The Dean of Carlisle, in his *Philosophy and Religion*, and also in his Bampton Lectures on *The Idea of Atonement in Christian Theology*, seems to avoid the difficulty and to take

what appears to me to be the only possible view from which we can intelligibly speak of our Lord's divinity. He says, in his earlier book:

> 'We cannot say intelligibly that God dwells in Christ, unless we have already recognised that in a sense God dwells and reveals Himself in Humanity at large, and in each particular soul. But I fully recognise that if this is all that is meant by the expression "divinity of Christ," that the doctrine would be evacuated of nearly all that makes it precious to the hearts of Christian people. And therefore it is all important that we should go on to insist that men do not reveal God equally. The more developed intellect reveals God more completely than the child or the savage: and (far more important from a religious point of view) the higher and more developed moral consciousness reveals Him more than the lower, and above all the actually better man reveals God more than the worse man. Now, if in the life, teaching and character of Christ—in His moral and religious consciousness, and in the life and character which so completely expressed and illustrated that consciousness—we can discover the highest revelation of the divine nature, we can surely attach a real meaning to the language of the Creeds which singles Him out from all the men that ever lived as the one in whom the ideal relation of man to God is most completely realised. If God can only be known as revealed in Humanity, and Christ is the highest representative of Humanity, we can very significantly say "Christ is the Son of God, very God of very God, of one substance with the Father," though the phrase belongs to a philosophical dialect we do not habitually use.' (pp. 180-1).

In his later book Dr. Rashdall says:

> 'In popular representations of the Atonement it is usually presupposed that the Son who undertook the task of man's redemption was a separate Being who had existed from all eternity side by side with the Father; and who, by an act of voluntary choice, distinct from the volition of the Father, consented to become man, and as man to suffer death on behalf of those whose nature he assumed. Such is undoubtedly the popular conception. But that is a theory which is open to insuperable objections, and it is not really orthodox. Catholic doctrine does not, it must be remembered, make the human Jesus pre-exist, nor (unless we take a view of the Fourth Gospel which criticism is almost unanimous in repudiating) did our Lord Himself ever claim such pre-existence for Himself. It was the divine Logos that pre-existed, not the human Jesus' (p. 444).

This conception of the 'human Jesus' perfectly indwelt by the divine Logos does not, I think, involve any contradiction of thought as the traditional doctrine appears to do. It seems to imply a miracle, if by that we mean something out of the general order, for there is no inherited taint of evil; but if God could create man as we know him in our own experience: and if we realize how imperfect man so created is, and yet that the very imperfection of which he is so conscious is a discipline

which leads to his development and to a desire to become more and more what he feels he ought to be, in other words that he has an ideal to achieve; is it at all incongruous that God should, in due time, reveal to him that ideal, in the only way in which such a revelation could be made, by causing to be born into the world a Man who, though susceptible to the temptations inherent in human nature, lived a sinless life and whose will at all times, by prayer and discipline, was in perfect harmony with the will of God? Such is, I take it, what is meant when we speak of our Lord as having been perfectly indwelt by the Logos of God.

What effect has such a conception on the fundamental elements of the Christian faith? The Christian faith is based on the great idea that 'God is Love': that He has not merely created man and then left him to work out his own salvation as best he can, but that He loves him in a sense far higher than the best human love we can know is capable of. It might seem at first that we should lose something of the sense of the sympathy of God, which for many is perhaps the most moving appeal of the Incarnation. But is it not just that sympathy that God has shown in doing all that even He could do to help man to realize his true relation to Him? Here was one greater than the greatest of the prophets revealing the nature and will of God so far as that is possible in terms of human life. If that life had not been truly human, how could we have learnt what human life was meant to be? Our Lord was the 'Captain of our salvation,' and was 'made perfect through sufferings.' He realised as no other man could ever do the awfulness of sin, for it is sin alone that separates man from God. What sin meant for Him was the distrust and hatred of those He sought to serve, and a cruel death in seeming utter desolation. With His unblurred spiritual vision He saw it all before it happened, not as pre-determined, yet as inevitable; but only so could He witness to His faith in the Fatherhood of God and win men to that faith. In His teaching He proclaimed that the Spirit which indwelt Him so perfectly would be ever with man and would lead him into all truth. This was the Second Adam, the New Man, Who perfectly fulfilled the will of God and bridged earth and heaven.

There is not, I think, any occasion here to deal with the difficulties of the story of our Lord's Resurrection, nor am I in any way qualified to do so; but, whatever view we take as to the precise way in which He appeared to His disciples after His bodily death, the fact remains that their faith in Him and in His witness called forth, in accordance with their Master's prediction, such an outpouring into their hearts of the Spirit of God as enabled them to live, in a measure, as He had lived and to go forth as God's ministers for the good of all men.

Whatever difficulties such a conception may involve, and it would be idle to contend that it is free from even great difficulties, they would appear to be as nothing compared with what seem to me, the insuperable difficulties which the traditional conception of 'the stupendous miracle of the Incarnation' presents.

If, as Dr. Rashdall says, the traditional conception is no Catholic doctrine, some other conception may not be as subversive as it might appear. It is not the first time in history that something of the same kind has happened. The Jewish people as a whole failed utterly to realize the truth of the revelation made to them. It became so overladen with accretions as to be almost completely hidden. But can we think that, like them, their great prophets would have failed to recognize in our Lord the fulfilment of all that their message pointed to? In a similar way the spiritual values to which our Lord bore witness have never been appropriated by the great body of His professed followers, but only by the few, here and there from time to time. For the rest, they have been not so much ignored as perverted, and the ordinary Christian standard is a travesty of what our Lord taught. All spiritual truth seems to tend to become distorted, and the language in which it is expressed, though susceptible of intelligible meaning, becomes hardened into unintelligible dogma.

Has not the time come for some competent student of Christology to work out, in all its implications, such a conception of our Lord as truly man and also in a special sense the Son of God, as will satisfy religious faith and philosophic criticism alike?

CHARLES E. HOWE.

THE EVOLUTION OF PRAYER

By the Rev. F. E. WARNER, Rector of Amberley, Glos.

IT is only of recent years that much attention has been paid to the subject of prayer in the comparative study of religions. And yet the importance of the subject can hardly be over-estimated. It is from man's prayers that we should be able to discover his conception of the god or gods to whom they are addressed, and it is through the study of his prayers that we should be able to trace his gradual ethical and spiritual growth.

An eminent Anglican theologian, the late Dr. Illingworth, says:

> 'However far we penetrate into the records of the past, we find it characteristic of man to pray . . . From the dawn of authentic history man has always prayed.'

But it is not far that we can penetrate. The material for our study, Dr. Farnell tells us:

> 'is unfortunately modern, not reaching back, that is to say, to a period earlier than some four thousand years before Christ; but this,' he adds, 'can be supplemented, as usually happens, by the evidence gathered from the lower societies as well as by the observation of practices that frequently accompany and are very closely blended with prayer even in the higher religions and that we may with confidence believe to have descended from an immemorial antiquity.'[1]

Yet good evidence from 'the lower societies' is not always easily attainable. On the one hand there is a not unnatural reticence and reserve on the part of the savage in speaking of his religious beliefs and practices to the European, and on the other hand there may be too great haste in jumping to conclusions on the part of the observer without sufficiently long and patient investigation. Still, I think it may be safely stated that prayer of some kind appears to be found among all races of mankind and as far back as we can trace the history of religion.

What is prayer? How are we to define it? '*Oratio est ascensus intellectus in Deum*' is that of St. Thomas Aquinas. Among modern definitions we may note the following: 'Prayer is the offering of desire to a Divine Being who is recognized

[1] *The Evolution of Religion*, pp. 163 *f.*

as personal and able to respond' (S. H. Mellone), or that given by Dr. Farnell, 'According to the modern definition of prayer man addresses uttered or inaudible speech to a Divine Power conceived as Spirit or God, but always as personal, in order to obtain material, moral, or spiritual blessings.'[2] Prayer must not be confined to vocal speech. The savage sometimes employs 'gesture-language,' and acts his religion before he has learnt to give it verbal expression. Altogether the definition in the hymn is not amiss:

> 'Prayer is the soul's sincere desire,
> Uttered or unexpressed.'

It is based on the two ideas of desire and of dependence on some power other than oneself to satisfy that desire.

In considering the gradual evolution of prayer from its lower to its higher forms, we may study its development with regard to (1) the objects to be asked for, (2) the true disposition of the worshipper, (3) the conception of the being or beings to whom the prayer is addressed: though of course we cannot regard these headings as watertight compartments, for they tend to react upon each other.

First, then, with regard to the objects desired in prayer. For the primitive man the problem is not so much to live well as to live at all, hence the blessings sought for are mainly, if not entirely, material. Mr. Routledge gives the following as the 'brief and delightfully typical prayer' of a M'Kikuyu of East Africa:

> 'O God my Father, give me goats, give me sheep, give me children, that I may be rich. O God my Father.'[3]

Here is the prayer of a North American Indian addressed to Wohkonda, the Master of Life:

> 'Wohkonda, pity me, I am very poor; give me what I need; give me success against mine enemies, that I may avenge the death of my friends. May I be able to take scalps, to take horses.'[4]

The Gold Coast negro raises his eyes to heaven, and prays

> 'God, give me to-day rice and yams, gold and cowries, give me slaves, riches, and health, and that I may be brisk and swift.'[5]

But it would be wrong to think that only such purely individualistic prayers are found among primitive peoples. On the

[2] Farnell, *op. cit.*, p. 165.
[3] Routledge, *With a Prehistoric People*, p. 227.
[4] Tylor, *Primitive Culture*, Vol. II, p. 365. [5] *Ibid.* pp. 367 *f.*

contrary, Dr. Estlin Carpenter tells us that 'Prayer in the lower culture is rarely individualised. It is almost always a social act.'[6] Common prayer is in fact the rule, personal prayer the exception. The head of a tribe or family prays for his people, as when a party of Algonquin Indians were setting out on Lake Superior in their frail bark canoes, their chief addressed a prayer to the Great Spirit:

> 'You have made this lake, and you have made us, your children; you can now cause that the water shall remain smooth while we pass over in safety.'[7]

Prayers for rain, for fruitful seasons, and for victory over enemies are naturally offered for the whole community. 'Anti-social desires,' says Jevons, 'cannot be expressed by the community or sanctioned by religion.' And he adds:

> 'Prayer is the essential expression of true socialism; and the spirit which prompts it is and has always been the moving spirit of social progress.'[8]

Yet at first these prayers are still limited by material needs. Tylor says that 'It scarcely appears as though any savage prayer, authentically native in its origin, were ever directed to obtain moral goodness or to ask pardon for moral sin.'[9] And a more modern authority confirms this: 'I have not been able,' writes Dr. Farnell, 'to find any example of a savage prayer for moral or spiritual blessings.'[10] Perhaps the highest point which prayer reaches in primitive religion is that reached by the prayer of the Khonds, a hill tribe of India:

> 'We are ignorant of what it is good to ask for. You know what is good for us. Give it us.'

A prayer well termed by Farnell 'a unique savage version of the great phrase, "Thy will be done."'

A higher stage is reached when moral and spiritual blessings are sought in prayer. The people of Corcyra, wearied with internal strife, inquire of the oracle at Dodona, 'To what god or what hero shall we pray in order to obtain concord, and to govern our city fairly and well?' This is a step higher than the asking for rain or 'the kindly fruits of the earth.' And as the individual attained a fuller and richer self-consciousness

[6] J. Estlin Carpenter, *Comparative Religion*, p. 149.
[7] Tylor, *op. cit.*, pp. 365 *f.*
[8] Jevons, *Introduction to the Study of Comparative Religion*, pp. 149 *f.*
[9] *Op. cit.*, p. 373. [10] *The Evolution of Religion*, p. 383.

he, too, began to recognize that 'man doth not live by bread alone,' to awake to the needs of his higher nature, and to express these needs in his prayers. Let us take a few examples from the great religions of the past to illustrate this development in prayer.

In the Babylonian liturgies there is much of spell and magic, and yet with this there are also real prayers offered in a spirit of fervent devotion. I shall refer later on to their remarkable penitential hymns. Here let me give a prayer of Nebuchadnezzar offered to Marduk, the patron deity of Babylon, on his accession:

> 'Oh, Eternal Ruler, Lord of All . . . lead the King by the right way . . . I am . . . the work of thy hand: after thy great mercy which thou showest to all, oh Lord, grant that thy high majesty may show compassion upon me: set in my heart the fear of thy Godhead: grant me what thou deemest best: for thou it is that hast created my life.'

A still more striking prayer is that addressed to Marduk by an unknown ruler:

> 'Oh Marduk, great Lord . . . let me behold thy Godhead, let me attain my heart's desire: set righteousness on my lips and grace in my heart.'

The public prayers of Greece, such as were used in the temple liturgies, have not been preserved as those of Babylonia have, and it is only from inscriptions and other literary sources, Dr. Farnell tells us, that we can gather some idea as to the objects of these prayers. The Athenian state prayed for the health and safety of the Athenian people and their families, and for the prosperity of their allies; but apparently it was only material blessings that were sought for. A deeper note is struck in some of the private prayers that have come down to us in Greek literature. Thus in the fifth century before Christ we have Pindar's prayer:

> 'O God, that bringest all things to pass, grant me the spirit of reverence for noble things.'

Socrates and Plato insisted on spiritual views of prayer, teaching that there was no need to particularize one's needs to God: far better to leave the choice to Him lest one should ask for what is harmful; and that prayer should only look to the spiritual, not to the material. Thus Socrates himself prays: δοίητε μοι καλῷ γενέσθαι τἄνδοθεν, 'Grant me beauty in the inward soul.' At a later date we have the prayer of the Stoic

Epictetus: 'Do with me what Thou wilt: my will is Thy will: I appeal not against Thy judgments.'

In the early religion of India we gather that, while the recital of spells formed a considerable part of Vedic ritual, and the strange idea was held that the power of the deity was nourished and strengthened by the prayers of his worshippers, yet a truer conception of prayer is also to be found. Some of them show a real consciousness of sin and a desire for forgiveness: 'Aditi, Mitra, Varuna, forgive us, however we have sinned against you. Through want of strength, thou strong and bright god, have I gone astray. Have mercy, Almighty, have mercy.'

If we turn to the ancient religion of Persia as it found its culmination in the teaching of Zarathustra, we find in the Zend-Avesta, together with much of spell and magic, true and real prayers. Farnell remarks on one special feature of these prayers, that is 'the enthusiasm of the idea of righteousness that pervades them, and . . . the conviction that the believer can aid Ahura-Mazda in the continual struggle against the powers of evil and in helping towards the final establishment of the righteous kingdom.'[11] Thus he prays:

> 'May we be such as those who bring on this great Renovation.'
> 'May we help to bring on the good government of Ahura, which is the best for us at every present hour.'

So the Zarathustrian religion taught its followers to pray for the coming of the Kingdom of God.

We have seen, then, something of the progress made from the asking for purely material blessings to petition for moral and spiritual qualities. A still higher stage is reached when prayer is regarded as not so much the petition for some blessing, but rather as a means of communion with God. This was the view held by the later Greek philosophers, especially the Neo-Platonists, and by the more thoughtful of the early Christian fathers. It is the view of prayer which lies at the root of all mystical, one might almost say all truly spiritual, religion.

There has, too, been a gradual growth in the idea of the true disposition of the one who offers prayer. What are the qualities which the worshipper needs? All prayer, even in its

[11] *Op. cit.*, pp. 216 .

humblest beginnings, implies faith. 'He that cometh to God must believe that He is and that He is a rewarder of them that seek after Him' is true, however crude or unworthy the conception of God may be. 'Faith itself,' says Dr. Hort, 'not being an intellectual assent to propositions, but an attitude of heart and mind, is present in a more or less rudimentary state in every upward effort or aspiration of man.' And even if the primitive savage is only asking for his daily bread, he is looking with faith and hope to a power he recognizes as able and willing to supply his need. But why was it that the power did not always respond? May it not be that the problem of 'Unanswered prayer' has something, at any rate, to do with the growth of morality and of the idea that righteousness is required in the worshipper? Let us suppose that the prayer for rain or for a good harvest has been offered by the ruler or priest on behalf of the community, but that it has not been answered. The natural conclusion is that the power invoked, the god of the community, is offended. Possibly the proper ritual has not been duly performed, or the power has not been addressed in the proper terms—hence the importance of knowing the due ritual and the true 'name' of the god. But granted that there has been no flaw in these respects, he may be wroth with his people because they have broken some *tabu*, and until this offence is expiated he will not hear their prayer. We have an illustration in the seventh chapter of the Book of Joshua. An unexpected defeat has overtaken the Israelites. But it is of no avail that Joshua prays to Yahweh for victory. The national deity is angry with his people because the *tabu* laid on the spoils of Jericho has been violated, and until the offence is expiated by the offender's death he will not hear their prayer. It is from such crude beginnings that morality takes its rise. Gradually higher ideas of what is required in the worshipper tend to prevail. It is not enough to avoid error in ritual or to refrain from breaking the *tabu*, but actual righteousness is required in those who worship a righteous God, whether in the case of the community or of the individual. And this growing sense of the need of righteousness begets penitence and confession. The famous penitential psalms of ancient Babylon testify to this. Some striking quotations from

hese are given by Dr. Jevons in *The Idea of God in Early Religions* (pp. 145 *f*). Thus the penitent cries:

'Lord, my sins are many, great are my misdeeds.'

And again:

'I thy servant, full of sighs, call upon thee. Like the doves do I moan, I am overcome with sighing. With lamentation and groaning my spirit is downcast.'

With the consciousness of sin comes the prayer for forgiveness:

'Rend my sins, like a garment My God, my sins are unto seven times seven. Forgive my iniquities.'

We have already noted a similar strain in some of the Vedic prayers, and the writings of Jewish psalmists and prophets with their deep sense of the Divine righteousness, together with the growing idea that God regards not only the outward act, but also the state of heart of the worshipper, afford us many striking examples. 'If I regard iniquity in my heart, the Lord will not hear me.'

But we must pass on to consider the ideas held with regard to the being or beings addressed in prayer. These ideas are at first often very confused. There may even be prayer without any direct invocation of a god. Thus in the dairy-ritual of the Todas of Southern India: 'May it be well with the buffaloes, may they not suffer from disease and die . . . may there be water and grass in plenty.' Note this is a prayer rather than a spell, yet a prayer without any address to a god or gods. On the other hand there may be belief in a 'High God,' but he may be regarded as too remote and inaccessible to be addressed in prayer, or as too great to be concerned with the ordinary matters of life, and therefore only to be approached on rare and special occasions. The Akikuyu of East Africa, we are told, 'turn to God in time of drought or great distress, but the ordinary ills of life are usually ascribed to the action of the spirits of the departed, and are to be dealt with accordingly.'[12] The conception of an All-Father is widely distributed among the native tribes of Australia, but the tendency is for Him, remote and in need of nothing that man can give, to become a mere name. When prayer is not offered to a god, the natural result is that faith in him languishes and decays. With belief in a tribal or national god,

[12] Routledge, *With a Prehistoric People*, p. 227.

who is intimately concerned in the welfare of the community, prayer gains in intensity. It is his *métier* to provide for the needs of his people, his honour is involved in their prosperity and welfare, while they are bound in loyalty to him to worship him alone and to assert his superior power over the gods of other tribes or nations—possibly even at the point of the sword. But if the idea of a national god was valuable in welding a people into a unity and in promoting to some extent the growth of national morality, it also tended to make them narrow, intolerant, and arrogant, and to manifest itself in feelings of bitterness and hostility to members of other nations. A further step upward is needed—to the conception of the God of all mankind. It was through the teaching of the great prophets of the eighth century before Christ that the Jews came to grasp this truth. But there was still room for advance in man's idea of God. The God Who was, and often still is, regarded as an arbitrary despot seated on a throne of glory in some far distant heaven, was to be revealed in the life and teaching of Jesus as the Father who cares for all His children, who can be addressed with confident hope and faith in that truest and most sublime of all prayers—the Lord's Prayer.

This brief survey of the gradual growth of prayer from its humblest forms to the height attained in the *Pater Noster* enables us to see in such growth an evidence of the working of the Divine Spirit in the heart of man; and to recognize in the highest and best aspirations and prayers in non-Christian religions the presence of that Divine Logos who is the Light 'that lighteth every man.' The fact of prayer is indeed a proof of the existence of God. 'The very desire to pray,' says a modern writer, 'is in itself prophetic of a heavenly Friend. A subjective need carries, at any rate, an implication that there is an objective stimulus which has provoked the need' (Rufus M. Jones). 'The soul,' he adds, 'possesses a native yearning for intercourse and companionship which takes it to God as naturally as the homing instinct of the pigeon takes it to the place of its birth.' 'The place of its birth'—for the impulse which prompts man to pray is the Divine 'spark' in his soul, which burning ever upward seeks the place of its origin in the bosom of the Eternal, where alone desire finds its full and complete satisfaction.

NEUTRALITY

By the Ven. R. H. CHARLES, D.D., F.B.A., Archdeacon of Westminster.

'He that is not with Me is against Me.'—Matt. xii, 30.

WHO is the Speaker, we may well ask, who made this claim, a claim absolutely unique and without parallel in the teaching of any other great religious leader in any age of the world?

The Speaker was a man who lived all His life in Galilee, saving for a few visits that He paid to Judea and adjoining districts. He came from a poor and despised city of Galilee. He had no advantages of rank or wealth. His education, moreover, though far above that of the skilled artisan class, to which He belonged, was not that which we associate with the learned schools in Jerusalem. And yet He knew Hebrew, and used Aramaic as His mother tongue, and must occasionally have used Greek: for Greek was familiar to many of the cultured and other inhabitants of Galilee, surrounded as they were on many sides by Greek-speaking cities. Of the first thirty years of His life we know nothing, save His notable visit with His parents to Jerusalem at the age of twelve. The thoughts that He had been pondering over even at that early age held Him fast in Jerusalem after His parents had left. When, after three days, His parents returned to look for Him, they found Him in the temple seated at the feet of the Doctors of Law and seeking for answers to the Divine problems that beset His mind. That He was ever afterwards indebted to the learned Doctors of the Law there is no direct evidence, though there may be some grounds for conjecturing some indebtedness. But if He availed Himself of their learning, He absolutely rejected their method of teaching. That is, He did not teach dogmatically and require His hearers to accept what He taught, because the Jewish Church said so, or certain great Rabbis so expounded. Not so; what He taught carried with it the evidence of its own truth in the conscience of such as had ears to hear. His use of the Old Testament also was wholly unlike that of the scholars of the Jewish Church and of Christian scholars down practically to modern times. The Jewish scholars quoted

the texts of the Old Testament in support of their argument wholly regardless of their original meaning and of the only meaning they could bear in their contexts. St. Paul, owing his Rabbinical education, is sometimes guilty of the same mi use of the Old Testament, and the First Evangelist in th second chapter of his Gospel (ii, 15, 23) seeks to prove tw events by two quotations, which in their original contexts hav no bearing whatever on or reference to these events. This us of 'proof texts' passed over into the Christian Church, and was only in the last generation that this misuse of Scripture w beginning, and only beginning, to be got rid of.

In the face of these facts it is in the highest degree remarkable that, when our Lord quotes the Old Testament, He quote it with a clear sense of the writers' meaning, and in such a wa as to bring out the essential truth of the prophetic message.

In the next place our Lord's independent and critical att tude towards the Old Testament was wholly unlike that of th Jewish Church and of the Christian Church down to the clos of the last century. Christ was the first higher critic. Thu He did away with the distinction which the law made betwee clean and unclean meats. He condemned the law also for th readiness with which in Deuteronomy it granted divorce o most inadequate grounds, and recalled His hearers to th higher principle stated in the opening chapters of Genesis. This was an absolute denial of the Jewish claim that the la was infallible, final and eternal, and prepared the way for S Paul's still severer criticism of its validity. Next He ap proached their idolatrous worship of the Sabbath, and declare that the Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sab bath. St. Paul followed closely in the footsteps of his Maste and was still more sweeping in his condemnation of the obser ance of certain elements of the law. He forbade circumcisio wholly, and put the entire law into a purely secondary plac maintaining that salvation was not possible through the worl of the law, but through faith and life in Christ.

Such being our Lord's teaching, an irreconcilable breac with the Scribes and Pharisees was inevitable. The hostilit of His opponents at last passed all bounds, and led them join with the Sadducees in bringing about His death.

Thus our Lord broke with the learned classes in Palestine —the Scribes, Pharisees and Doctors of the Law. With the Sadducees He had already broken when, at the beginning of His ministry, as the Fourth Gospel tells us, He drove forth those who sold and bought in the temple, thus making an attack on one of the great and unworthy sources of revenue of the Chief Priests.

Thus our Lord stood almost alone against all the religious, learned and ruling classes of His nation, but though standing thus alone, He made the tremendous claim: 'He that is not with Me is against Me.' If any of the greatest thinkers or religious leaders of the ancient world had so spoken, the mass of mankind, alike its wisest and its unwise, would have turned away in derision or in indifference. In completest contrast with these words stands the claim of Socrates, the wisest of all the Greeks. Far from declaring himself the possessor of any final or even partial form of wisdom, he maintained that the point in which he excelled all other teachers was just this, that in the field of truth he knew his own ignorance and was conscious of his own limitations. And yet this young Prophet of Galilee, Who never wrote a book, Who taught only for three years, and by His teaching and life alienated the so-called wise and learned men of His own nation, Who won only a few converts, and finally died a malefactor's death, used no words of idle assumption when He said: 'He that is not with Me is against Me.' History has shown in unmistakable terms the truth of these words. His life and teaching, as they reach ever wider and wider circles down the ages, have been steadily forcing alike individuals and nations to take thought and to take sides either for or against Him. For, wherever His teaching comes, there follows deep travail of heart, broodings, doubts, conviction, the kindling of high hopes and fresh resolves, or of opposition, malignity and hate. In fact, all that met Him unconsciously fell into one of three classes. The first was composed of those that accepted and loved Him; the second of those that rejected and hated Him; and the third of those that neither loved nor hated Him, but took up an attitude of neutrality or indifference towards Him. Such a division is at first sight an obvious and apparently a justifiable one, but is it

a true one? Are there really three classes? When man is brought face to face with such claims, Christ declares that it is not: 'He that is not with Me is against Me.' This is the study before us.

Now, since the most outspoken attempt to justify the attitude of neutrality has appeared in recent years, we shall adjourn the consideration of this question for the present, and study the reception which Christ's claim met with in His own time.

The record of Christ's short ministry of three years is at the same time a record of the growing hostility of His countrymen against Him. The priestly and learned classes, as we have already shown, early took sides against Him. This hostility was due to the radical antagonism existing between their character and teaching and those of our Lord. Their character we know. Their teaching was essentially dogmatic. Our Lord's was essentially not dogmatic. He appealed to the conscience of His hearers and never required a blind acceptance of His words.

On the defection of the ruling and learned classes, there still remained the masses (especially in Galilee) that were attracted by His teaching. Amongst these there were two types easy to distinguish. The first was represented by the peasants of Galilee. These Galilean peasants were intensely patriotic; they were full of national prejudices, but were on the whole moral and religious, and formed the best and soundest part of the nation. They cherished ardent expectations of the Messiah, and accordingly welcomed the young Prophet with the wildest enthusiasm. This enthusiasm so alarmed the Pharisees and Chief Priests that time and again they sent down chosen representatives to confront the young Prophet and crush Him with their arguments in the presence of the people. But He was not to be crushed. They could not entrap Him by their subtleties, nor get the better of Him by their cajoleries or flatteries. Sitting loose to all self-interest and ambition, He was beyond the reach alike of their bribes and their menaces. The failure of all such attempts to corrupt or crush the young Prophet served only to raise Him higher in the regard and reverence of the Galileans, till at last they sought by force to make Him their king. Now, had our Lord lent Himself to their Messianic aspirations, He could easily

have made Himself the master of all Palestine. But He refused to do so. He stood resolutely aloof from all the political parties of Palestine, as He had from the religious. He made no appeal to popular or class feeling. He declined to be drawn into disputes about property or capital. With a word He could have won the masses to His side. But He would not speak that word. And when, notwithstanding His refusal to become their king, some of the same multitudes still followed Him, He turned and set forth His claims in such severe terms, that they forsook Him forthwith, and only a bewildered few still clung fast to their allegiance.

But Christ drew faithful disciples not only from the sturdy peasant class of Galilee. He found them also amongst the publicans and sinners—classes that philosophers had regarded as hopeless, and popular opinion had branded with infamy, and by its merciless attitude had hardened into callousness and despair. Now amongst these Christ went in and out and found, where it was wholly hidden from other eyes, the honest and good heart. By His wondrous sympathy and His faith in the goodness still latent within them, He lifted them out of their despair and sin, and quickened them with the power of a new life. Here also sides were taken for and against Him in all those who came under His immediate influence.

This necessity of taking sides for or against Christ becomes still more inevitable where individuals and not classes are dealt with in the Gospels. There we find every man put to the test at his weakest point, and not a single jot of Christ's exclusive claim to supremacy is toned down or foregone, whoever the individual may be. Christ wants no disciple, who has not counted the cost. Everyone is tried exactly where, owing to his character, he is sure to feel Christ's service a hardship, exactly where sin is most attractive and conscience is most asleep. To the man who is adjourning the day of decision to a more convenient season He says: Let the dead bury their dead, but come thou, follow Me; to the man who is covetous and whose chief desire is set on riches: Sell all that thou hast and come, follow Me; to the impure man: Whoso looketh upon a woman to lust after her, hath committed adultery already with her in his heart; to the unforgiving: If ye forgive not men their trespasses, neither will your Heavenly Father for-

give you; to the proud and self-satisfied: Except ye be converted and become as little children, ye shall in no wise enter into the Kingdom of Heaven; to the mass of commonplace folk belonging to all classes, who study first and chiefly and always their own interest and their own ease, but cloak their selfishness under the fashionable respectabilities of the day, He declares: 'Whosoever saveth his life—taketh the line of least resistance or any other form of self-indulgence or self-satisfaction—the same shall lose it.'

Having now sketched in briefest fashion our Lord's attitude to the classes and individuals of His own day, we return to the question whose consideration we adjourned: Are there really three divisions amongst men with regard to Christ? Those who accept Him: those who reject Him: and those who are neutral and take no sides in the matter. In other words, is neutrality possible, when the claims of Christ, whatever forms of truth or duty they assume, are brought home to men? As we have already stated, Christ declared that such neutrality was impossible: 'He that it not with Me is against Me.'

Now, as we have already observed, this claim is one without a parallel in human history. Can it be admitted? To this question there are two answers. The first is that of certain physical scientists, who maintain that it should not be admitted, and that a man should not believe that which is not proved and proved by evidence satisfactory to physical science, and that, until such evidence is forthcoming, he should adopt an attitude of neutrality.

The second answer is that the claims of Christ can be justified, not by the evidence of physical science, but by evidence of a higher order, and that this evidence is within the reach of all who would have it, and that neutrality in the face of such evidence is at once irrational and suicidal.

Now the case of the physical scientists was stated in its most vigorous and uncompromising form by Kingdon Clifford towards the close of last century.

> 'Belief is desecrated when given to unproved and unquestioned statements for the solace and private pleasure of the believer . . . It is wrong always, everywhere and for everyone to believe anything on insufficient evidence.'

This means—to put it in its crudest form—that it is wrong to believe in anything that cannot be proved by the senses.

But many of us, perhaps most of us, are aware that, if we judge physical science by this standard, it has no claim on our acceptance. For physical science is itself based on an unproved hypothesis—the hypothesis that the world is rational, that the laws of cause and effect are here and everywhere and always observed. Now this hypothesis of the absolute uniformity of nature has never been proved, nay more, it cannot be proved to demonstration by the evidence of the senses, or any other kind of evidence. What science can do is just this. By accepting the belief or hypothesis that nature is uniform, it can make discoveries, and every discovery is fresh evidence in support of this belief, and this evidence is growing in volume and conclusiveness as research advances. Yet, notwithstanding science is always outrunning the evidence, as in fact it must do if it is to make any progress at all. Is it, therefore, strange that in the world of religion faith must also outrun the evidence on which it acts? In fact, my brethren, the faith of every great scientist, of every true hero, of every real saint, outruns the evidence on which they respectively act: the spirit of high adventure and self-sacrifice is common to all these classes, and not one of them can justify his action from the standpoint of evidence demonstrable to the senses. Faith in each case springs from the necessity of satisfying an inner need of the spirit. In the case of the scientist there is the need of believing that nature is subject to uniform laws, and that these laws are discoverable; in the case of the hero and the saint, there is the need of believing that this material world at its best can only satisfy our lower nature and is only a symbol of something above and beyond it, something spiritual and divine, to know and serve which they are assured is better than life itself.

In the next place, if the evidence of physical science were the only kind of evidence admissible, we should of course have to admit that there was no longer any just or reasonable ground for religious faith. But having made this concession, we cannot logically stop short there: we must go further and confess that no rational evidence can be produced in favour of morality over and against immorality. Hence from the standpoint of

purely physical science moral anarchy, such as prevails in Russia, has just as much to say for itself as the sublimest morality.

Let me make this point clearer. The task of physical science is to discover *that which is* in the realm of nature, not *that which should be* in the world of moral and spiritual beings. It is to accumulate and classify all the facts that come under the observation of the senses: not to determine their character for good or ill. Should it discover, as it may, the means of breaking up atoms into their ultimate elements, it would, it is believed, arm the nations with the power of absolutely exterminating each other to the last man. But this is no concern of science; for science as science cannot say whether human life is a good thing or a bad. In fact it does not pronounce, nor can it pretend to pronounce, on the goodness or badness of any fact or process it brings to light. It is thus wholly incompetent to deal from its limited outlook with the moral and spiritual worlds that transcend its province. But though physical science cannot deal with the ultimate truths of religious faith it can make some contribution, but this contribution is negative rather than positive. Its chief service is to free the human mind from credulities, superstitions and self-delusions.

Having now done with the objections of physical science to faith, we have next to estimate the value of the comparative claims of science and faith on our allegiance. Now we all know that it is a matter of complete indifference to most of us whether certain laws of science are facts or not. Unless it is our specific duty to study these laws, we can adopt an attitude of absolute neutrality towards such conclusions of science as Einstein's doctrine of the relativity of knowledge, or the theory of the Röntgen rays, and a hundred others, and be not one whit the better or one whit the worse by the adopting of such a neutral attitude.

But in regard to the claims of the moral and spiritual worlds neutrality is impossible. And why? Just because these claims bear directly on our conduct and shape our conduct, whether we will or no, for good or evil. Hence, if they are true, they are of vital importance, and if we adopt a neutral attitude towards them, such neutrality amounts to a rejection of them; for we cannot stand still, morally or spiritually. If we are neutral,

we are drifting, and drifting inevitably towards an attitude of indifference and spiritual death, or of active opposition.

The late Professor James, the most brilliant psychologist of his generation, rightly maintains this very truth in his interesting work, *The Will to Believe*. Neutrality, he urges, in such provinces is impossible. In their own domains, as we have already observed, the faith of the hero, as well as that of the scientific investigator, must outrun the evidence, if either of them is to be worthy of the name. But, whereas few men are fitted for scientific research, and not many are called to be pre-eminently heroic, all men are required to accept or reject the claims of moral and religious truth, For, with the exception of a minority, that constitutionally are mentally or morally incapable or have made themselves such, all men are fitted to judge between the claims of right and wrong in some degree; in some degree I repeat, and, when confronted with two alternative courses of conduct, to decide which is the higher and which the lower. But, not only are men fitted to decide for or against a certain line of action, they are bound by the essential nature of the spiritual and moral laws to come to a decision. For belief and doubt affect our conduct and affect it vitally, and herein enters the claim of Christ: 'He that is not with Me is against Me.' Hence if in such a case a man should say: I will adopt an attitude of neutrality, or I will come to a decision at a more convenient season, such a man by so doing has already decided against the moral or religious claim at issue. For by failing to comply with it, he has acted as if there were no such claim, and, because he has not taken sides with the higher claim, he has actually taken sides against it. Hence we repeat that, as the faith of the hero or that of the scholar engaged in original research must outrun the evidence of the senses, so religious faith must in a still greater degree outrun such evidence. As the scholar and the hero act each in obedience to an inner need which he cannot justify on purely logical or scientific grounds, so the religious man acts in obedience to a still deeper need. James defines the religious man as one who believes 'in the existence of the unseen world in which the riddles of this natural order may be explained.' He maintains that the will to believe helps to create the facts, a result which

is unattainable without such belief. Hence we should approach the claims of religion with the will to believe. Here religion means not belief in this or that particular dogma, but the spiritual world as a whole. It is quite true, as we know from our every-day experience, that faith in a fact does help to create the fact. This truth was stated over two thousand years ago by the Roman poet, Virgil,[1] in his description of the great boatrace, where he speaks thus of one of the leading crews in the race: *possunt quia posse videntur*—'they have the power to win because they believe they have.' By believing that we can master a difficulty, we have in part equipped ourselves with the power to do so. By trusting in another man's good faith, we may beget that very virtue in him. By owning that we are responsible beings and acting accordingly, we become more conscientious. In fact it is often 'our faith beforehand in an uncertified result' that 'is the only thing that makes the result come true,'[2] and 'life is worth living since it is what we make it from the moral point of view.'[3] Thus faith in a fact helps to create the fact, but—only so far as the fact is dependent on our own personal action. James, by omitting this limitation, seems in his essay to imply that our faith in the unseen world without us does in some way create this unseen world.

But the will to believe cannot create that which was in existence before the act of belief, and is and will be in existence after it, whether we will to believe or no.

The will to believe certainly tends to create a fact that is dependent on our personal action, but it cannot create the spiritual world that is independent of us. And yet in respect of this spiritual world, the will to believe can render invaluable service. It cannot create that world, but it can create evidence attesting the reality of that world, and day by day can contribute fresh evidence. Faith in God finds its own verification through the influence it exerts on life and character.

The practical results of a belief provide evidence by which its truth or falsehood may be tested. By its fruits ye shall know of what character it is. Thus, though the will to believe

[1] Aen. V. 231.
[2] James, *Will to Believe*, p. 59. [3] *Op. cit.*, p. 61.

cannot create truth that is independent of us, it can create evidence of truth that did not before exist. Hence St. Paul writes to his disciples, 'Ye are our epistles'—that is, epistles of the Lord 'known and read of all men,' and our Lord admonishes His hearers: 'Let your light so shine before men that they may see your good works and glorify'—not you, but 'your Father, which is in heaven.' Thus every good life is creating fresh evidence attesting the reality of God and of the spiritual world. Wherefore, my brethren, we cannot halt between two opinions of vital importance. If the ever accumulating evidence of Christian lives attests the reality of the spiritual world, then neutrality is impossible and wrong; for it amounts to a decision against the claims of Christ. There are thus no neutrals in this never-ending strife between Christ and the claims of the material life. Instinctively or deliberately, here, and there, and everywhere, the consciences of men are enrolling themselves and cannot help enrolling themselves on this side or on that. It is the inevitable law of this struggle that not a single, solitary soul escapes this moral and spiritual conscription, and such is the greatness of this strife that the whole universe is divided into two camps—for Christ or against Him—and even the most distant stars fight, and must fight, in their courses against those that reject Him. 'He that is not with Me is against Me.'

THE EMMAUS EUCHARIST

By the Rev. W. D. Bainbridge-Bell, M.A., Hon. C.F., Vicar of Epsom.

AGAIN and again it has been borne in upon me by experience of very different parishes that the opportunity of communicating in the evening ought to be offered, for the sake of those—stablemen, bakers, nurses, farm labourers, postmen, milkmen, 'general' and other domestic servants—to whom the early hour is practically impossible. And we must not juggle with the word 'impossible,' and instance the possibility of air-raids, or houses aflame, or abnormal conditions. This is not fair. It should be left to the individual to describe his own circumstances. Other people who do not know them from within, must trust an earnest man's word. It is monstrous to

say, 'Nonsense; you could, if you had the will,' especially if the person offering the explanation adds, 'give me a later Communion, and I shall be there.'

But no incumbent cares to fall out of line with the great majority of his brethren when their action is endorsed by those who speak with recognised authority. And so, many of us waited, and waited, trying to believe that the general consensus of opinion against evening Communions was right. But years went by, and the impossibilities were not overcome, and still the great majority of non-servanted men and women were conspicuously absent from all altars. I speak of those who were devout, and regular attendants at other services of the church. The result was a grievous misunderstanding. In my first parish I was told by a sturdy thresher that he and his neighbours looked upon the Holy Communion as 'the gentry's service,' and not intended for working men.

Then came the war. The exigencies of the front line and gun-positions and wagon-lines compelled padres of all views to offer the Holy Communion at any hour of the day or night.

But the men sometimes said: 'Why can't we have the same opportunity at home? Some of us find it just as difficult to come early as we do out here, and as for our women-folk, with the children to get off to Sunday-school and the breakfast to prepare, they cannot manage it. Some of us have horses to look after, as we have out here (I was with the Gunners), and others have cattle and pigs to feed, and cows to milk. Even if the church were near the stables, or farm, if you had our job, how often could *you* manage it?' This cogent argument was corroborated by the testimony of 'land girls,' who told me that, though in pre-war days they never had missed their early Communion, they now found it to be practically an impossibility.

Soon after I came back from France, being single-handed, I told my mission-church congregation that I should have to ask them to come a short half-mile to the parish church for their Communions. They pleaded for an evening Communion. My bishop bid me act on my own discretion in the matter, so I consented. The result was noteworthy. The monthly average of less than ten rose at once to a monthly average of thirty-five.

Impressed by this increase, I felt I ought to offer the same

sort of opportunity at our parish church. We had recently ntroduced a Choral Eucharist after very short Matins (as an ntroit). I felt that the same beautiful service ought to be available to the poorer members of my flock. So we started an evening Choral Eucharist, once a month. Again the offer was welcomed, and again a number who had been debarred hitherto began to come regularly. The early communicants came as before: indeed, their numbers during the year have risen by nearly 200. Besides this there are an average of forty communicants (besides non-communicating worshippers) at the evening hour every month.

Now one of the objections which I can remember used to be made against evening Communions was that they were begun, after full Evensong and sermon, when the worshippers were tired. To avoid this we first thought of substituting the Choral Eucharist for Choral Evensong, but finding that some early worshippers desired Evensong, we gave them about twenty verses of the Psalms, and the second lesson and Magnificat, and then went to the altar and began the Communion office, preaching a short sermon after the Creed. In this way the whole service is completed in about an hour and twenty-five minutes, and the devotional capacity is not over-strained. I think this is one important point.

There is another. If the evening Communion is offered, it must certainly not be offered grudgingly or with disparagement, as if it was, so to say, a lesser sacrament. This would be to spoil with the one hand what is given with the other. And speaking for myself (though I am reluctant to draw back the veil of reticence), I think I ought to add that at the Emmaus hour I have been granted a spiritual and mystical exaltation so elevating and transporting as to be in the nature of a heightened and enhanced experience.

It seems as if the morning sacrifice suggests the vigour and energy of self-consecration and its reinforcement by the gift of the abiding Presence; the evening Eucharist unfolds the secret of the joy that no man taketh from us, and the peace which passeth all understanding.

So much for my own experience. I venture to contend that the prevailing practice has been *partly* determined by the lighting question. We forget that the modern facilities of lighting

churches *are* modern. Half a century ago there were hardl any evening services. The first thing that I had to do in m parish, in 1891, was to buy lamps for my church. Evenin baptisms, evening confirmations, evening services, are an inn vation: in many places abroad they are still unknown.

The practice of fasting Communion goes back to the tim when people broke their fast about mid-day, and the table groaned and the beverages consumed were strong. Com munion after such a 'break-fast' was evidently 'not con venient.' As to ceremonial fasting, as distinct from this, w are told by modern authorities that it is not according to th mind of Christ. Dr. Rashdall, after reviewing the evidenc in his lectures (*Conscience and Christ*) in reply to the critics c Christian teaching, says:

> 'It seems to me impossible to deny that our Lord had by this tim come to realise that fasting—at least fasting in obedience to defini ecclesiastical injunction at frequent intervals—was not congenial t the spirit of the new gospel of the Kingdom, which He was proclaim ing' (p. 160).

Dr. Homes Dudden takes much the same view in his articl 'Asceticism,' in Hastings' *Dictionary of Christ and the Gospel*.

The 'original and primitive' Christians certainly had the Eucharists in the evening. But in the second century the seem, possibly owing to heathen slanders, to have changed t the morning—and in most cases to a very early hour. The had, as the majority of them were slaves, to have their service out of working hours. *Tempora mutantur.* Nowadays th employer class can go more easily in the morning, and the em ployed, or wage-earning class, more easily in the evening.

But why should we make this new departure now? Hav conditions altered, and, if so, how? I think that we shall a agree that the desire for frequent Communion among earne people is more widespread than fifty years ago, and much mo than a hundred years ago. And growing facilities for effectiv lighting synchronise with this desire for spiritual illuminatio

If Communion *does* mean communion, is it not a timeles relation? Must we not try to get to God's point of view? C Him the Psalmist speaks in tones above our questioning, an with sure insight: 'Even the darkness hideth not from The The night is as clear as the day. The darkness and light t Thee are both alike.'

The bearing of this matter on dreams of Re-union is worth onsidering.

Our Roman brethren find in 'Benediction' an outlet for he need of evening Eucharistic devotions.

Our Nonconformist brethren have their Eucharistic wor-hip at the same time, in response to a not altogether dissimilar esire. Extremes appear to meet. The people, to whom we inister here, are of the same race and of the same hours of mployment. Would it not be well if at least some of us ould generously and bravely abandon our prejudices in these ays of new adventure and prayerful experiment, and sym-athetically meet the cry, which in some is inarticulate, in some epressed by us, and in some vociferous, for the Emmaus Com-nunion at the *end* of the day of the Resurrection (*John* xxiv, 13).

I would conclude with two quotations both from the *Guardian* newspaper. In an article on 'The Progress of the Old Catholics' in the issue of December 2nd, 1912, we read:

> 'The Old Catholics of Rorseback held an afternoon or evening Communion on the National Commemoration Day. This action was sarcastically commented on by the Roman Catholic *Ostshweiz*. But strange to say we learn from the *Katholik* that at the Roman Catholic Eucharistic Congress lately held at Vienna, Dr. Mair, Professor of Theology, was permitted to read a paper in favour of the celebration of afternoon or evening Mass.'

n the course of a graphic account of the consecration of two Swedish bishops in Upsala Cathedral, contributed to the *Guardian* of October 8th, 1920, by the Bishop of Peterborough, ie writes:

> 'Evensong followed later, and at 8 p.m. the Holy Communion was celebrated. The people—there was a huge congregation and some two hundred communicants—all joined in the music. It was essentially a people's act of worship. The majority of the communicants, so far as I could see, were working people. Everyone knew the Office. It combined the dignity of the Mass with the fervour of a prayer-meeting. I was compelled to ask myself whether this was not nearer the intention of the Feast than the respectable and complacent cathedral celebration at 8 a.m., with its handful of communicants from the Close, or even than the midday Choral Eucharist in which no one outside the choir dares to give voice to his emotions. If to our minds the Church of Sweden has something to learn as to the place of the Eucharist, alike in the *régime* of cathedral worship and in the spiritual life of the individual, we on our side have much to learn and far to go if we are to restore it to its rightful place as the service in which evangelical fervour finds its most congenial expression, and in which the emotion of fellowship is allowed its full and proper scope.'

IN MEMORIAM

JOHN ELLIOTSON SYMES

John Elliotson Symes, second son of Dr. Symes, was born at Grosvenor Street, London, in 1847. He was educated at University College School, and Downing College, Cambridge. At the University I read omniverously—theology, poetry, novels, sociology—all the great works of the great Victorians, then being poured out in splendid profusion. He was President of the Union, and a member of the Cambridge Metaphysical Society ('the Apostles').

On leaving Cambridge he became Mathematical Master at Lancing and from 1875 to 1880 he was one of the first group of Cambridge University Lecturers, lecturing on History, Political Economy, and English Literature, in Hull, Barnsley, Nottingham, Cardiff, Plymouth, and other places. At the same time he did a good deal of clerical work, and familiarised himself with life in the East End, during a curacy at St. Philip's, Stepney.

In 1880 he became for a year second master at the Grammar School, Newcastle-on-Tyne, and it was during this period that he preached his *Newcastle Sermons on Theology and Life* (John Hodges, 1882). Then he went to Nottingham, where the bulk of his life's work was done. The newly founded University College began in a small way, but when Mr. Symes retired, after thirty years work, during the last twenty of which he was Principal, he left behind him a large many-sided institution, to which had been added Commercial, Technical, Engineering and Mining Departments; and also a Day Training College for Elementary Teachers. This last was especially the creation of Mr. Symes' brain and the object of his affection. He had keenly realised the inadequacy and narrowness of the education provided for Elementary Teachers, for whom, in the best interests of the country, a broad outlook is essential. In 1884 he suggested to the Board of Education the desirability of utilising University Colleges for the training of Elementary Teachers; and this suggestion was carried out in 1890. Mr. Symes persistently struggled to widen the curriculum drawn up for these young people, so as to make it less pedagogic and more general. He also urged that they should work with other students and not be herded into a little fold, apart. On these points he steadily fought the Board of Education.

During his life in Nottingham Mr. Symes did as much preaching as his scanty leisure allowed. He characteristically incurred odium by attempting to start a Women's Trade Union among the Lace Girls, at a time when such an organisation was greatly needed. Charity Organisation, Children's Country Holidays, and the S.P.C.C. were among his activities. During these years he wrote several books, all of them short, pithy, and suggestive.

Political Economy (Longmans, 1888), now in its twelfth edition.
Prelude to Modern History (Longmans, 1890).
Companion to School Histories of England (Longmans, second edition, 1891).
The French Revolution (Methuen, second edition, 1904).

He also wrote most of the articles on industrial topics in Traill's *Social England.*

Mr. Symes left Nottingham in 1911. Since then his health gradually failed and he had several severe illnesses, but his intellectual vigor

emained unabated. He was greatly interested in what is usually called ligher Criticism, and in the liberalising and rationalising of Anglican heology. He became a member of the Council of the Churchmens' Union, nd watched its growth with warm interest and sympathy. But for ncreasing bodily weakness he would have devoted much time and energy o this movement, for he considered that a progressive and reasonable Christianity was the one remedy for the ills of the civilized world. Neverheless, he was little addicted to attacks on popular theology. His work n the field of thought was essentially constructive.

During these last years he wrote *Broad Church* (Methuen, 1913) and *The Evolution of the New Testament* (delayed by the war, but shortly to e published). He also contributed the article on his beloved master, F. D. Maurice, to Hastings' *Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics*. During the ast few years Mr. Symes held winter chaplaincies at Viareggio, Biarritz, Seville, Berne, and Mont Estoril. He went south last November with the prospect of a chaplaincy in the spring, but he grew rapidly weaker, and lied at Palermo on March 31st, at the age of seventy-three.

BOOK NOTICES

A NEW FRENCH THEOLOGICAL REVIEW

This is the first number of a review which may have a chequered istory and an important influence.

The University of Strasbourg, following the fortunes of Alsace, has ad a past full of catastrophes. In 1621 it was established by the Emperor Ferdinand II as a German University, and although Alsace was annexed o France in 1681, it retained its German character until the French Revoution. Napoleon I constituted it a section of the University of France. n 1870, at the end of the Franco-German War, it was refounded as a nodel German institution, with various Faculties and a very distinguished body of Professors. Now it has again changed its nationality: but the University aspires to be cosmopolitan and international. There is ttached to it a Faculty of Protestant Theology in which the distinguished heologians Lobstein, Ehrhardt, Ménégoz and others hold office. The new *Revue* is to be the organ of the Faculty, with help from Paris and Geneva. The comparatively ancient *Modern Churchman* welcomes its young colleague with hope and enthusiasm.

The first paper, by the Pastor L. Monod, is entitled 'Vérité et Liberté,' nd is an expansion of the text 'The truth shall make you free.' Naturlly, in eight pages, it cannot go beyond generalities, and it sketches no lefinite programme. But the papers which follow, by Reuss, Vermeil, Causse, Lobstein, Goguel and others, show that the *Revue* is to be both istorical and philosophical-religious; and on both lines it reaches a high standard.

The most interesting paper is that of R. Reuss, son of the very disinguished critic Edward Reuss, which sketches the history of the French Faculty of Protestant Theology at Strasbourg down to 1870, when it disppeared. The present *Revue* is intended to take up the suspended work of he French Faculty, and to carry it on. During the German period the heology of Strasbourg was represented by most distinguished names, such as H. Holtzmann, Spitta and Budde: but French Protestantism has note of its own; and a body which has produced such men as the two

* *Revue d'Histoire et de Philosophie religieuses.* Year I, No. 1. Published by the Faculty of Protestant Theology of the University of Strasbourg.

Sabatiers, the two Révilles, Scherer, and Ménégoz has a right to a hearing in the Christian world.

Edward Reuss was the great figure in the Faculty. When we consider that he was born in 1804, it seems astonishing how he anticipated, and forwarded, the lines of modern critical thought in regard to the New Testament and the history of early Christianity. Among his younger contemporaries, Scherer, Colani, Verny, Secrétan claim special mention. Between them, these men founded and carried on the *Revue de Théologie et de Philosophie Chrétiennes*. Its circulation was never great, and it was often in pecuniary straits, which indeed brought it to an end in 1869. But it had a most important influence in shaking up the conventions and complacencies of the orthodox French Protestantism, and showing the way to a wider faith. One gathers from Mr. Reuss's paper that there was a good deal of friction among the leading spirits; and the *Revue* seems to have been more successful on the critical side than on that of reconstruction. But 'wisdom is justified of all her children,' and the removal of what is decayed is as necessary for the renovation of Christian belief as the removal of inadequate foundations has been in the case of some of our cathedrals. French and Swiss liberal theology, I mean not merely the Modernist works, but those of such writers as Boutroux, Brunetière, Brémond, Bos, Secrétan and Frommel, are not only infinitely more intelligible than those of their German parallels, but they have a different character, partly no doubt due to the working power of the Roman Church in France.

I may add that, among the reviews of books in the the new *Revue*, is a very appreciative one by M. Goguel of Dean Rashdall's great work on the Atonement.

P. GARDNER.

THE REALITY OF PSYCHIC PHENOMENA.*

The difficulties in the way of anything like a scientific explanation of the data with which psychical research claims to deal are undoubtedly great. For, first, there is the possibility of sheer and deliberate fraud, which is recognised by friends and enemies alike. And, secondly, in so far as the question considered relates to the agency at work in the phenomena investigated, there is the difficulty of constructing experiments in which the facts cannot be accounted for as being in some way due to the sub-conscious activity of the medium. In consequence, the inquiry is supposed by many people to have attained so far only to somewhat inconclusive results.

Now, in relation to any phenomenon, whether psychical or not, the question, 'What exactly happened?' is prior to the question, 'Who made it happen?' And it is at least a tenable view that the second question has no chance of being answered satisfactorily until the first has been pretty thoroughly investigated. May not some of the difficulties of psychical research, in its attempt to reach a conclusion as to the agency behind psychical phenomena, be due to its not having sufficiently studied as yet the actual processes which the phenomena involves?

If this is a reasonable view, it would be hard to exaggerate the importance of the researches which were carried out by the late Dr. Crawford up to the time of his death last year. Dr. Crawford was a scientist in a peculiarly materialistic branch of study,—that of engineering. He was Lecturer in Mechanical Engineering in the Municipal Technical Institute

**The Psychic Structures at the Goligher Circle.* By W. J. Crawford, D.Sc. London: John M. Watkins, price 10/6 net., pp. vi, 152, with numerous diagrams and photographs

Belfast, as well as in the Queen's University. His habit of mind, no less than his professional training, made it natural for him to treat phenomena by means of spring balances, electric bells, chemical dyes, photographs, gramophones. He knew what it meant to construct not merely one experiment but a series of experiments which aimed at the gradual elimination of false hypotheses and the establishment of true ones. And this kind of investigation is precisely what, in its present stage, the subject of which we are speaking most urgently needs.

We cannot deal adequately with his last (posthumous) book without referring first to an earlier one, and the digression is fully justified by the importance of his work, and the amazing character of his results. He started off from the phenomenon of a table levitated in the ordinary way at a psychical séance. To some people the only question arising is, 'Was somebody playing tricks? or, if not, who made the table rise?' But to Dr. Crawford, with his mind ranging over ideas of action and reaction, the problem was one of mechanics. The table was an ordinary one of wood and glue; it could not tilt or rise in the air without the application of some force; and this force, just because it was capable of operating on material objects, must be subject to simple mechanical scrutiny. Its upward action on the table must be balanced by a downward reaction somewhere else; so weighing machines were placed in various positions beneath the table, on the floor and at different levels. In some positions no reaction could be detected, but in others it was found and measured. As, however, it was not as a rule exerted on the floor, it was obvious that the weight of the table must be supported elsewhere. It was a possible hypothesis that it was supported by the medium, even though they were not in contact in any ordinary fashion. So the medium's chair was placed on a weighing machine, with the result that alterations of weight were observed which corresponded with the weight of the levitated table. Crawford's investigations were carried out in an exhaustive series of experiments which are fully described in *The Reality of Psychic Phenomena,* published in 1916. As we read, we watch his hypotheses taking shape, being disproved or confirmed, and at last leading to a single definite conclusion,—that, in some manner unexplained but incontrovertible, a structure, which is not bodily in the ordinary sense, is extruded from the medium's body, probably from the legs or feet, and, though invisible alike to the eye and the photographic plate, is responsible for all the phenomena taking place within the circle.

It will be noted that the experiments provide no answer to the question whether the agency at work in this structure is that of the medium's sub-conscious personality, or is that of disembodied spirits, nor does the author claim to be dealing with this question at all. In a preface he states his own private conviction that the latter is the case, but this forms no part of the thesis of the book, nor does it affect the nature of the experiments or the conclusions which they establish.

In the work at present before us, Dr. Crawford takes up the problem at this point, and carries his investigation further by experiments of a similar kind, which, as in the previous volume, are described with the fullest detail. Rappings, which had before been made on the floor, were now received on surfaces of soft clay, in order that information might be gained as to the shape and size of the terminations of the rods which caused them. On one of the impressions so obtained there were found black particles which proved to be diminutive fragments of lacquer from the *inside* of the medium's shoes. This suggested the idea that the 'psychical structure,' though not materialised except at its end, must be capable of

taking up, in its extrusion from the medium's body and in its return, suitable material substances placed in its way. We cannot go into detail with regard to the remarkable experiments in which traces of clay were found outside and inside the shoes and stockings of the medium after the soft clay surface had been 'rapped.' It must suffice to say that they furnished at last a complete account of the path taken by the structure both within and outside her shoes. And it is worth while to add that the precautions taken to prevent fraud were of the most stringent sort; the medium's feet were sometimes locked into a framework which made their movement impossible, at other times they were placed on rests so adjusted that the removal of either foot would have caused the ringing of an electric bell; moreover, the marks discovered about her feet were such as could not have been produced if any attempt had been made to rap with them in the ordinary bodily way.

A further series of experiments sought to trace the path of the structure by means of dyes. It will be worth while to quote from the description of one of them:

> 'There was a tin filled with clay coloured with methylene blue fixed to the floor beyond the radius of action of her [the medium's] feet. Marks were made on the clay in the usual way.
>
> 'The blue clay made a huge mark on the boots and went above them to the stockings in each case. All down the heel of one stocking and right along the sole and even up the front of the stockings there were hundreds of tiny blue pieces of clay, too small to be seen by the eye and requiring a magnifying glass for their detection . . Also, up the leg as far as the knee there were many tiny pieces of blue clay caught in the fabric, and some of these pieces went to the very top of stockings' (pp. 124—5).

And again, a few pages later:

> 'Medium sat in her séance boots, with her feet on the electrical apparatus. Carmine powder was placed in the soles of the boots. At the end of the séance, on one stocking, there was clearly marked the path of the carmine up to just below the knee' (pp. 128—9).

It will, no doubt, have occurred to some readers that if the 'structure' consists of some form of matter withdrawn from the medium's body, it should be possible to detect a diminution in her weight and volume. Alteration in weight had been noted in the earlier book; the present one investigates change of volume. It appeared that the ultimate source of the extruded matter was in the legs and trunk, and Crawford found that the rise and fall of the flesh was apparent to the touch; it seemed, he writes, 'to become soft and cave in' (p. 145). To test this scientifically an experiment was performed. A string was bound tightly round the medium's legs, which were placed as close together as possible, and was attached to a spring-balance hanging from the roof. The balance indicated a tension of 4 lb.; and on each occasion on which psychic matter issued from the medium the tension was reduced to 1 lb., being restored to 4 lb. on its return. The author points out that any involuntary movement of the limbs would have *increased* the tension.

Not the least amazing part of this volume is the collection of photographs at the end. Within the last few months of his researches Dr. Crawford found it possible to take actual flash-light photographs of the structures themselves, although his previous attempts to do so had failed.

The importance of the investigations described in this book, and in the earlier one to which we have referred, cannot easily be exaggerated, and

its scientific temper is evident throughout. It appears to the present writer that it contains nothing which definitely requires the reader's acceptance of any particular hypothesis as to the ultimate origin of the activity described, and, as we have already said, this is a question with which the author does not attempt to deal. He is concerned with processes, and the processes which he expounds are sufficiently astonishing in themselves. The book is one which no one who is interested in this branch of modern research can possibly afford to disregard; while its sober and methodical style will, we are sure, carry conviction even to the minds of those persons who have hitherto been disposed to reject such phenomena as unworthy of serious consideration.

C. F. RUSSELL.

THE SACRAMENTS—PAST AND PRESENT *

In less than two hundred pages Miss Gardner has dealt with four aspects of her subject. She begins with a consideration of the elements in primitive religion, out of which the sacramental principle developed. From thence she passes to an historical survey of the Christian theology of sacraments, and notices in passing the sacramental view of life in general. Finally she applies this view to the problems and conditions of contemporary life. It follows that, where so much is attempted in so small a book, there is a certain incompleteness and summariness about the treatment of the subject as a whole.

The book begins with a consideration of the relationship of sacrament to the three elements of religion—institutional, intellectual, and mystical. The author feels that 'sacrament has, at different times and under different conditions, been almost exclusively associated with some one of the three'; and that therefore 'a study of what the sacraments have been in the past, and may be in the future, may prove to be a help amidst the stress of the present day.' In her treatment of the *origins* of sacrament as revealed in primitive religion, Miss Gardner is careful to distinguish 'symbol' and 'sacrament'; though the sacramental character of religious acts is more due to later interpretations of these acts than to their original purport. At any rate, the result of research into primitive religious customs is to reveal the fact that sacramentalism is by no means the monopoly of Christianity, but that the Early Church was fully prepared by contemporary conditions for the introduction of such practices.

In dealing with the Christian sacraments, Miss Gardner adopts a fourfold division of her materials into sacraments of initiation, purification, the common life, and authority. It is obvious that some sacramental ordinances (*e.g.* Baptism) belong to more than one such category; and, generally speaking, Miss Gardner is hampered in this section of her book by the difficulty of defining which ordinances of religion are, or are not, sacramental. She is on surer ground when she traces the history of controversies and decisions regarding the nature of the sacraments. She considers the story of these controversies under six heads: (1) the fourth-century Fathers, (2) the Berengarian controversy, (3) the Lateran Council of 1215, (4) St. Thomas Aquinas, (5) the Councils of Florence and Trent, (6) the Reformation. In considering the work of St. Thomas Aquinas, she does not fail to lay due emphasis on the influence of hymnology upon popular sacramental conceptions. The chapter which deals with the Reformation gives a remarkably lucid account of the distinguishing features of the sacramental doctrines of Luther, Zwingli and Calvin. Again Miss

* *History of Sacrament in Relation to Thought and Progress*, by ALICE GARDNER, M.A. Pp. viii + 189. (Williams and Norgate, 6/- net.)

Gardner is forced to acknowledge the difficulty of establishing any fixed line of demarcation between sacraments and non-sacramental ceremonies. The Anglican distinction—'ordained by Christ Himself'—would seem to 'exclude Baptism and include the foot-washing on Maundy Thursday.'

Miss Gardner has already written an essay on John the Scot, and a chapter devoted to the sacramental teaching of Dionysius, the Areopagite, and his disciple John is amongst the best in this present book. Here the author insists on the fundamental importance of distinguishing between the concept of *validity* and that of *efficacy*. 'Validity resides in accordance with legal obligations.' If the legal conditions are fulfilled, the Sacrament is valid. Efficacy, on the other hand, admits of degrees and depends, to a large extent, upon the spiritual condition of the recipient.

The last chapters of this book deal with the place of sacramental conceptions in the thought of to-day. Politics, morality, art and culture have all alike certain relations with sacramentalism, and Miss Gardner displays great skill in tracing those relationships.

With regard to the present-day movement towards re-union, Miss Gardner advocates 'inter-communion' as a more effective starting-point than either 'hierarchical organization' or 'interchange of pulpits.' 'We do not gain much sense of fellowship with a congregation by sitting occasionally at the feet of their pastors, with whose views we may or may not agree. Kneeling with others before the altar is a very different thing.' She admits the difficulty of securing in such a case the assurance of some spiritual discipline; but when the need is really felt, the way of meeting it is likely to be found. With regard to the whole question of the methods by which re-union is to be obtained, we agree with Miss Gardner that 'comprehension and laxity are by no means convertible terms.'

This book is a notable contribution to the study of sacraments from the critical point of view. Inevitably it calls for expansion. Those who read it will find it an incentive to a further and deeper study of the problems which it raises. To have provided such a stimulous in so small a book is no mean achievement.

H. L. HUBBARD.

CHRISTIANITY IN ACTION

Twenty-five years ago Walter Rauschenbusch told us that 'the essential purpose of Christianity was to transform human society into the Kingdom of God by regenerating all human relations, and reconstituting them in accordance with the will of God.' To-day an increasing number of Christians are willing to accept this judgment as true. In all denominations there is a growing passion for social service, a readiness to explore

[1] *The Social Function of the Church*, by Malcolm Spencer. Pp. 256. Student Christian Movement, 1921. Price 6/- (Paper 4/-).

Christ and Human Need, being Addresses delivered at a Conference on International and Missionary Questions, Glasgow, January, 1921. Pp. 202. Student Christian Movement, 1921. Price 3/-.

The New Testament and Modern Life, by Sydney Herbert Mallone. Pp. 280. Lindsey Press, 1921. Price 6/-.

Christianity applied to the Life of Men and of Nations, by Charles Gore. (Essex Hall Lecture). Pp. 51. Lindsey Press, 1920. Price 2/-.

The Parables of Jesus applied to Modern Life, by J. Cyril Flower. Pp. 116. Lindsey Press, 1920. Price 3/-.

Is Christianity Practical? by P. H. Wicksteed. Pp. 93. Lindsey Press, 1920. Price 3/- net.

the wider implications of the Christian faith. The discovery of the mind of Christ is seen to be the first duty of the Christian Church, and we find in many quarters a frank recognition that no modern problem—whether international, social, or economic—is beyond the range of His spirit. Fired by this conviction scholars are investigating anew the teaching of the Jesus of History, not indeed with the intention of formulating a Christian Decalogue, but rather for the sake of eternal principles from the study of which help may be gained for the Christian solution of the world's problems.

This is the aim of the six volumes which are here grouped together.[1] While differences of emphasis are from time to time apparent, there is yet a surprising unanimity in the main conclusions at which the authors arrive. For all Christ is central. In every mind we see the certainty that in Him, and in Him alone, lies the secret of the world's peace. This is no gentle truism of the conventionally orthodox. In every case there is an appeal to the facts of experience. All alike offer both to Churches and individuals the challenge to accept the full implications of Christianity, and to bring the mind of Christ to bear upon the bewildering complexity of modern problems. The study of such books is a tonic for failing hearts, a task both humiliating and inspiring, a duty which no Christian of the present day may shirk with impunity.

Mr. Malcolm Spencer has given us a book of permanent value. The work is characterised by a welcome soundness of judgement upon the many questions with which it deals. This is not merely another way of saying that the opinions of author and reviewer happen to coincide, for the refreshing many-sidedness of outlook will be obvious to every reader. The well worn theme of the Church's failure is unflinchingly elaborated, but never from the mere love of scolding, never without the frank acknowledgment of the Church's positive achievements in the sphere of social reform. The social task of organised Christianity in the present age is set forth in a manner which will arouse the enthusiasm of many for whom the Church's more conventional activities have little attraction. Words like fellowship, co-operation, service, express the spirit of the book, but we are never left with vaguely inspiring abstractions. Mr. Spencer is able to show us the Christian spirit taking form in modern life; he unpacks for us the high-sounding generalities of the pulpit orator, and forces us to look at the practical significance of the contents. We are never allowed to rest content with 'masked words in lieu of thinking.' Abstract terms, as the author points out, 'are not plain terms to ordinary folk.' In the necessary and difficult work of translating abstract into concrete Mr. Spencer excels, and herein lies perhaps the supreme merit of a book whose merits are many.

The papers delivered at the Student Christian Movement Conference at Glasgow in January of the present year are well worthy of being brought together into a single volume for permanent possession. International and missionary problems are treated with a freshness and penetration into essentials which make it easy to understand the enthusiasm with which the speakers were listened to in the first instance. Not seldom reports are dry reading, even though originally a conference of which they give the substance may have been of great interest. In the present case the Glasgow spirit of white-hot enthusiasm for a Christian world is conveyed even to the reader who was not fortunate enough to have heard the speakers. The needs of India, Africa, China, are presented by experts on fire with their subject. No one reading these papers can fail to recognise the close interrelation to-day between missionary and international

problems, nor can he remain long in ignorance of the need (imperative now as never before) of carrying the spirit of Christ into the business activities of the world. The question: 'Is Christendom fit for a World Task'? calls forth a spirited denunciation of our present industrial system and of international relationships. God is presented as the Supreme Reality, available and powerful for human life; God's Kingdom as not merely an inspiring idea 'with which it is easy to play as a sort of mental pastime,' but as a tremendous fact dominating the outlook of the Christian, and influencing his conduct at every turn. If the ideals of the Glasgow Conference of the world's students were to take visible form in the life of nations, the final issue of that struggle between idealism and materialism, the signs of which Viscount Grey bade his hearers watch at the present moment, would be no longer in doubt.

Dr. Mellone's volume, *The New Treatment in Modern Life,* takes us into a different atmosphere, the atmosphere of critical scholarship, careful investigation of evidence, detailed exegesis, restrained and balanced judgements. Yet the problems with which he deals are the same in substance as those of Glasgow, and he, too, would find their solution in Jesus Christ. The book opens with a penetrating and scholarly estimate of the central thoughts of Jesus on such matters as the Divine Fatherhood, human brotherhood, the value of the individual, the essential significance of the idea of the Kingdom. Dr. Mellone is markedly successful in the delicate task of separating kernel from husk, seizing and isolating the eternal element in a great saying in contrast to the temporary vehicle of its expression. The second section of the book, which treats of the social and political background of the Gospels, gives the reader valuable assistance in achieving for himself this necessary work of separation. Our author has little patience with the parrot-cry 'Back to Christ,' being eager to insist that the so-called secondary strata of the Gospels are precisely those which show us the teaching of the historical Jesus expressing itself through the minds of His first followers. Paul and *Acts* reveal to us what we most want to see when engaged in a study of the significance of Jesus for modern life—the spirit of Jesus struggling to adapt itself to new conditions and non-Jewish modes of thought. The answers of twentieth century Christianity faced, *e.g.* with the evil of slavery or the desire of women for emancipation will inevitably differ from the answers of Paul, yet both alike may be the expression of one and the same spirit. In an appendix there are valuable notes which, as the author reminds us, with a shrewd appreciation of human failings, 'are intended to be used.'

The three remaining volumes are slight in bulk, though not without importance. Bishop Gore's paper on *Christianity as applied to the Life of men and of Nations* forms one of the series of Essex Hall lectures, the first of which was delivered in 1893. The Bishop, when referring to the intimate spiritual affinity between the teaching of Christ and that of the great prophets, points out how that affinity is frequently obscured to-day by the Church's habit of moral compromise, a habit responsible for a situation 'as remote from the intention of Christ as can well be conceived.' Dr. Gore emphasises 'the passionate feeling of contempt and repudiation of the Churches on the part of a great body of the workers,' alludes bitterly to the majority of pulpits as 'more anxious to avoid offence than to proclaim the truth,' and, with reference to the League of Nations, laments 'the weak and languid support provided by the Churches for the movement which declares that patriotism is not enough.' The lecture is full of courageous utterances of the kind which we have learned to expect from one to whose mind the revolutionary social implications of Christianity are of the very essence of the Gospel of Christ.

In attempting the application of the parables of Jesus to modern life Mr. Cyril Flower is certainly moved by a true instinct. Whether the particular applications which he suggests in the series of essays before us will commend themselves to the reader must depend on the latter's general attitude towards life as well as on his personal estimate of the teaching of Jesus. For ourselves we feel that the interpretation of many parables is far-fetched and the exegesis, on occasions at least, of a doubtful validity. For example it would never have occurred to us, had not Mr. Flower suggested it, that in the parables of the Lost Sheep and the Lost Coin we have our Lord's condemnation of the Pharisees, who cared more for sheep and money than for the human soul. Still, as Dr. L. P. Jacks points out in a brief introduction, 'All the parables of Jesus produce immediate reactions in every mind that encounters them, and not the least interesting part of our experience in reading this book will be to note the difference between the author's way of reacting on the theme and our own.'

The sermons which contain Dr. Wicksteed's answer to the vital question 'Is Christianity Practical'? were delivered more than a quarter of a century ago, but we share with the publishers a sense of satisfaction that he has consented to allow them to be reprinted. The bearing of Christianity on personal, social, commercial, and political life is at once fearlessly and sanely indicated. A Christianity which cannot express itself through every human relationship is, as Dr. Wicksteed insists, not merely negatively valueless, but positively harmful. Visions of truth and beauty which are forever incapable of realisation serve only to tantalise the seer. The whole philosophy of a life lived in water-tight compartments is seen to be bankrupt in the face of the Christian ideal of human society permeated with the spirit of Christ. Conditions may not alter greatly in forty years, but we believe that whereas in the 'eighties' Dr. Wicksteed can have found few to stand with him in his courageous appeal for applied Christianity, to-day his social teaching will find a multitude of whole-hearted adherents. W. Maurice Pryke.

CORRESPONDENCE

THE CHRIST OF HISTORY.

To the Editor of The Modern Churchman.

Sir,

May I beg a brief space in which to reply to the courteous criticism of Professor Gardner, and to the article of Mr. Clutton Brock?

Professor Gardner thinks that my three alternatives—a didactic, an eschatological, and a mythical Christ—are not in fact mutually exclusive, although they may be in logic. The three figures have, indeed, common characteristics. It will hardly be denied that there are mythical elements in the Gospels. It is also certain that the Saviour taught. He not only announced that the Kingdom of God was at hand. He also called men, in view of its nearness, to 'repent.' The core or kernel of such repentance was a turning from 'dead works to serve the living God.' So He insisted that it was not what men did, but what they were, that mattered in God's sight. He described the character to be looked for in those who would enter the Kingdom. Such teaching, however, does not conflict with the conception of Him I have taken in my lecture. A man, as I think, can have but one vocation, while he may have many interests. Mr. Gladstone, to take Professor Gardner's instance, said, if I remember

right, that it was his vocation 'to work the institutions of his country.' His life had one central purpose, but he had, of course, many interests and pursuits.

I dare not ask for room which would allow me to deal adequately with Mr. Clutton Brock's article. I must confine myself to making my own position more clear than I appear to have done in the lecture.

My conception of our Lord's work on earth is derived entirely from what the Synoptic Gospels tell me. I do not approach these Gospels with a picture in my own mind which I ask them to confirm. I construct my picture from their statements and indications.

I find in these books that the earthly ministry of Jesus had, as its central call, the announcement that the 'Kingdom of God' or of 'Heaven' was 'at hand.' It is plain to me that 'at hand' can have no other meaning than 'quite near.' The expression is further defined in a subsequent passage as meaning within the life-time of the existing generation (Mark ix, 1; Matt. x, 23). It is also plain that the coming of the Kingdom was a change such as would be visible to the disciples and also to men generally (Mark xiv, 61). Although the Kingdom was 'within' or 'among' the disciples, it would yet find outward expression.

Is it, then, possible that the Saviour meant by the Kingdom of God some ethical or spiritual change in the thoughts of men which would not be apparent to the outward eye and which would, of necessity, be slow and gradual? The character of our Lord's teaching as recorded in the Synoptic Gospels entirely, in my judgement, forbids such an assumption. I find Him here invariably speaking so that His listeners might grasp His full meaning. He speaks always to be understood, using simple words and homely illustrations, and avoiding difficult and remote ideas. It is quite impossible for me to suppose that He should have had one conception of this important expression in His own mind, while He allowed His hearers to entertain a different conception. Nor can I believe that He was not the master of His own thoughts, so as to be unable to grasp and present them in their fulness. He knew what He said.

In one important respect I find Him modifying greatly the popular conception of the Kingdom of God. This modification did not affect the visibleness of the Kingdom, nor the time of its advent. It touched the character of its citizens and the blessedness they would enjoy under its sway. Only the pure in heart would enter it or find happiness within it. God Himself was to be the Ruler of the Kingdom, and only those who loved Him would be happy under His sway.

Was Jesus, then, a 'deluded prophet'? The bare suggestion would convict any theory with such an implication of presumption. The Kingdom, although it did not come at once, or come at all as an external transformation, came as a Kingdom of the Spirit. The hope, like all the other great expectations of mankind of which I can think, was realized, although not in the form in which it was at first conceived. It was seed sown in the ground and God gave it a body as it pleased Him. The Fourth Gospel shows us the spiritual reality of which the Jewish Kingdom of God was only a symbol. Here the disciple of Jesus who loves Him and keeps his sayings finds in the actual communion with Jesus which he now enjoys an assurance that his Master has not deceived him and has not been a deluded prophet. Hope of a future Advent is not excluded, but it is expressly asserted that to the faithful disciple Jesus has already 'come' and in coming has fulfilled His promise.

I will only add that my solution of the difficult problem in question has not been reached hastily, nor without some hesitation. Those who have

to teach the Gospels cannot select the passages with which they will deal, and ignore others which they may find it difficult to interpret. They have to answer the questions which their pupils ask. The solution I have indicated above has established itself for me by the best of all methods, that of repeated trial and experiment. It enables me to read the Gospels without arbitrary excisions or disingenuous 'explaining away.' It also gives me a reason why the earliest Christians should have believed, as they universally did, that 'the night was far spent and the day at hand.'

J. GAMBLE.

LEIGH WOODS, CLIFTON, BRISTOL.

FAITH HEALING AND SPIRITISM.

To the Editor of THE MODERN CHURCHMAN.

SIR,

Correspondence arising out of correspondence is, I know, not a thing to be encouraged, but the concluding sentence of Mr. Guy Kendall's letter headed 'The Creed of a Reunited Church,' in your last number, calls for comment. Speaking of short statements of belief, he says:—

> 'That such are necessary is plain, unless we desire to have "the full flood of Theosophy, Christian Science and Spiritism, with their half-truths and nonsensical charlatanism, poured into a Church which can assimilate much that is exotic, but hardly these."'

Now leaving Theosophy aside, of which I am not competent to speak, it is surely a fact that faith healing in the Church by prayer and laying-on of hands is on the increase, and this is one of the fundamental principles of Christian Science. Christian Science without Mrs. Eddy is Christianity, and the Church should not surely do anything to close her doors to Christian Scientists.

Though not a spiritualist, I consider, as a student of the subject, that it is a bold thing in these days to speak of spiritism in the way Mr. Kendall refers to it. Has Mr. Kendall read of Dr. Crawford's experiments at Belfast, I wonder, and is he a student of the Psychical Research publications? Waiving both Christian Science and Theosophy, it will be a fatal error if the Church bars her doors, or rather shuts her ears, to the truths of spiritism—namely, to the belief that the dead are alive and progressing here (perhaps) and now, and are not awaiting the Judgment Day before the 'next move.'

It is consoling in this connection to read 'The Future State' in this very number of *The Modern Churchman*. In fact, it is fairly clear that Mr. Kendall's views are in this respect out of touch with the spirit of *The Modern Churchman*.

ERNEST S. THOMAS.

CAIRO, EGYPT.
29th March, 1921.

PRAYER-BOOK REVISION—A CORRECTION.

To the Editor of THE MODERN CHURCHMAN.

SIR,

In my letter on Prayer-Book Revision in your April number, in my desire to save space I quoted from some rough notes on M. Brückner's comment on I. Cor. xi, 23. I find I was too concise. I stated that

Brückner says the account of the Institution of the Eucharist therein recorded is not historical. What he really says is 'The Pauline account of the Last Supper is in all probability not a purely historical one, but is a dogmatic representation of the festival.' I should be obliged if you could kindly find room for this correction, as accuracy, like fair play, is a jewel.

J. HECTOR DE COURCELLES.

THE ANNUAL MEETING AND ST. MARYLEBONE.

To the Editor of THE MODERN CHURCHMAN.

SIR,

As on June 16th the Annual Meeting of the Churchmen's Union is to be held in St. Marylebone parish and the annual service in the parish church, a few words on the locality may be of interest.

The earliest records are to be found in Domesday Book (1086). The most ancient church in the parish was dedicated to St. John the Evangelist and remained standing till 1400 A.D., when it was demolished and replaced by the church of St. Mary, built on a site close to the present church. For nearly three centuries and a half it remained the centre of religious life in the parish until 1740, when it was pulled down and a new one built. The interior of the old building is shown in one of the plates of Hogarth's 'Rake's Progress.' The new church soon grew too small for Marylebone, which from a small village was rapidly becoming a suburb of London. At the end of the 18th century the population of the parish was 70,000. The present church was opened in 1817, the former building being used (as it is still) as a chapel of ease. The architect was Thomas Hardwick, a pupil of Sir W. Chambers. The new church cost the immense sum of £70,000, and was enlarged and altered at great expense in 1884. In the old churchyard is the tomb of Charles Wesley, whose pall was supported by eight clergy of the Church of England. Robert Browning was married to Miss Barret in the present church, and after her death he came every year on the anniversary of his wedding and remained an hour in prayer and meditation. Charles Dickens was also a parishioner for some years, and frequently consulted the parish register for names for his characters.

Our members cannot fail to find the parish church, as it looks through York Gate into Regent's Park.

P. H. BAGENAL.

NOTICE OF CHURCHMEN'S UNION ANNAUL SERVICE AND MEETING.

11.30.—Holy Communion at Marylebone Church. Preacher: The Rev E. St. G. Schomberg, of St. Andrew's, Ashley Place.

3.0.—Business Meeting in the Marylebone Church Hall.

Owing to the Coal Strike the Public Meeting at 5 p.m. has been cancelled.